SOME

REMARKS

(by G. Ridpath)

Upon a late Pamphlet, Entituled,

AN ANSWER

TO THE

Scots Presbyterian Eloquence.

WHEREIN

The Innocency of the *Episcopal Clergy* is Vindicated, and the Constitution and Government of our Church of *Scotland* Defended, against the Lies and Calumnies of the *Presbyterian Pamphleters.*

by W. Shadrach

Deut. XXXIII. 29.

Thine Enemies shall be found Liars unto thee, and thou shalt tread upon their High Places.

Psal. V. 9.

For there is no Faithfulness in their Mouth, their Inward Part is very Wickedness. (Wm S[trachan])

IMPRIMATUR,

Dec. 20. 1693. *Guil. Lancaster.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Joseph Hindmarsh*, at the *Golden-Ball* over-against the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhil.* 1694.

TO THE

Most Reverend Father in God,

JOHN

Lord Arch-Bishop of *Glasgow*.

May it please Your Grace,

HOW soon I entertained any thoughts of *Publishing a Discourse of this Nature, in Vindication of our Church and Clergy, I was easily determined to send it abroad under Your Lordships Protection. You have been such an Eminent Sufferer and Confessor in*

thoſe woful Calamities of our Church and Nation, have been Perſecuted to ſuch a height, both in Perſon and Reputation; meerly for the Defence of our common Principles, that you may juſtly challenge the Patronage of ſuch a Treatiſe as your due.

Your Merit having juſtly Advanced you to ſuch a Dignity in the Church, as to be a Father of the Clergy; I therefore preſume you will not decline to Eſpouſe any thing that is Writ in a juſt Defence of their Innocency. The moſt of thoſe Perſons, whoſe Vindication I have here undertaken, have ſometimes lived in Your Graces Dioceſe, are perſonally known to you, and you have had frequent occaſions to ſearch into the whole courſe of their Life and Converſation, ſo that I dare the more boldly Appeal to your Lordſhips Impartial Judgment, if what I have ſaid here in their Vindication be any more than is Juſt and Reaſonable; and what the ſevereſt Judge will readily acknowledge to be their due.

While the Enemies of the Church are at Work to Calumniate and Accuſe the Clergy; your Grace being placed in ſuch an Eminent Station, could not well expect to eſcape the Cenſure of their Malice. The Office you bear in the Church, and the Sacred Character you have ſtamped upon you, expoſe

poſe you more Remarkably to the Malice of ſuch Vermin as deſpiſe Religion, and trample upon all that's Sacred. But your Lordſhips Character and Merit is ſo Univerſally known, that whatever Malicious Reports are Raiſed upon you by the Enemies of our Church and Religion, deſerve not a particular Confutation.

However your Grace has been pleaſed to gratifie your Enemies ſo far, as to take ſome Notice of their Calumnies, and has Annexed to this Treatiſe ſuch an irrefragable Aſſertion of your own Innocency, as cannot fail henceforward to ſtop the Mouths of your moſt inveterate Enemies.

My Lord, I don't queſtion but you are always ready under your Troubles, to practiſe that Chriſtian Doctrine of Patience, you have ſo often Recommended to others, and I hope God, in his own good time, will put an end to theſe National Judgments, and recal your Lordſhip from your Exile, to be again an Ornament to our Church, and to aſſiſt in the Rebuilding of the Second Temple, and making it more Glorious and Beautiful than the former; that to the Excellent Conſtitution of our Church-Diſcipline, we may have added a ſet Form of Prayer and Devotion, and then our Church ſhall again Flouriſh as a Palm-Tree, and forever

forever after be immoveable as a Rock. So begging your Lordships Paternal Benediction, I am with all Duty,

My Lord,

Your Graces most Obsequious

and Faithful Servant.

W. S.

TO THE READER.

THE most effectual way of Undermining Religion, is to bring those who propagate it into disgrace and contempt. If once we Receive bad Impressions concerning the Lives and Morals of our Teachers, we will not readily hearken to their Exhortations of Piety and Morality.

The Authority of our Spiritual Guides is at an End, if we fancy them to be addicted to those very Sins and Vices, which they so vehemently Preach and Exclaim against, and denounce woful Judgments against all that practise them; we easily believe that they are not in earnest with what they profess; and we are Tempted from hence to conclude Religion to be a meer Cheat and Imposture.

This Method of ſubverting Religion has been always thought ſo ſucceſsful, that if we look back into the Hiſtory of former Ages, we ſhall find, that ſince the firſt Plantation of Chriſtianity, it has been the conſtant practice of all its Enemies to Slander and Revile thoſe that did promulgate it, to accuſe them of the groſſeſt Immoralities they could imagine; thinking by this means to give ſuch a fatal ſtroke to the Chriſtian Religion, as to prevent its Conqueſt over Judaiſm and the *Pagan* Worſhip.

Was not the Author of our Religion himſelf, the Holy and Bleſſed Jeſus, Reproached with the Title of a Glutton and a Wine-bibber? Were not all his Followers, even in the firſt and pureſt Ages of Chriſtianity, charged with Atheiſm, for contemning the Worſhip of the Heathen Idols; with inceſtuous Mixtures, and with eating Childrens Fleſh in their Holy and Sacred Myſteries?

This Heathenish and Abominable Practice of calumniating our Adverſaries, ſeems to have been copied by moſt of the Sectaries of the Chriſtian Religion; but I think, by none more exactly than our Presbyterian Diſſenters, who have never failed to lay out all their Induſtry and Wit, in contriving Forgeries and Calumnies againſt both Clergy and Laity of the Orthodox Communion.

In our late Civil Wars, when the Presbyterian Schism prevailed over this whole Island, when the Churches both of *Scotland* and *England* were quite overturned, and the Clergy Persecuted and Exposed to the greatest Hardships of Poverty and Want; their Persecutors, to justifie this their Cruel and Barbarous Usage of them, did industriously represent them to the credulous people, as ignorant of their Profession, and highly scandalous in their Lives; loading them with the most Villanous and Immoral Crimes they could think of.

Thus were the whole Body of the English Clergy at that time maliciously assaulted, and accused of all the Crimes their Enemies could invent against them, as appears from the *Centuries of Scandalous Ministers complained of to the Parliament, Anno* 1646.

So likewise in their present Persecution against the Church of *Scotland*, they revived their Old practice of Slandering those whom they had most unjustly Persecuted.

When they had Rabbled the Clergy from their Churches, and Acted such Villanies and Indignities upon their Persons and Families, as the most Savage Barbarians would have been ashamed of; the Noise of this Persecution spreading abroad, they found it convenient to Publish and Divulge

all the Lies and Calumnies they could invent against our Clergy, leſt they ſhould ſeem to have Perſecuted them without any ground; and thinking likewiſe by this Stratagem, to exaſperate and raiſe the Indignation of all good Chriſtians againſt them, upon account of thoſe heinous Villanies with which they maliciouſly charged them.

Such Uſage as this could not fail to Exerciſe the Patience of the Clergy, to ſee themſelves ſo injuriouſly Perſecuted and Reviled. But they had this for their comfort, that they received no worſe Uſage than their Maſter had done before them; *It is enough for the Diſciple, that he be as his Maſter, and the Servant as his Lord; if they have called the Maſter of the Houſe* Beelzebub, *how much more ſhall they call them of his Houſhold?* But thanks be to God, the Lives and Converſations of the far greateſt part of our Clergy are ſo apparently Pious and Exemplary, ſo exactly conform to the Character they bear of being Spiritual Guides, Burning and Shining Lights, that as the Calumnies of their Adverſaries, cannot much injure their Reputation in this World, ſo far leſs will they be able to diminiſh that Eternal Reward laid up for them in the Life to come.

However,

However, when the Clergy are thus maliciouſly and unjuſtly Slandered and Reviled, Religion does often ſuffer thereby; and therefore in this Caſe, I think it is the Duty of every Chriſtian, to Eſpouſe the Intereſt of Religion, and to Vindicate the Clergy from thoſe Aſperſions their Enemies load them withal.

There is not a more certain fore-runner of Atheiſm and Irreligion in a Nation, than a contempt of the Clergy; and it may juſtly provoke God to remove his Candleſtick quite from us, if we ſuffer his Miniſters and Ambaſſadors to be Treated with ſuch Reproach and Contempt; it is a ſhrewd Sign we have no great Reſpect for a Prince, if we affront his Ambaſſador.

Although I am not in Holy Orders my ſelf, yet I have ſuch a Veneration and Eſteem for that Sacred Function, that it raiſes my Indignation to a great height, to ſee Ingenious and deſerving Men Buffoon'd and Ridiculed, meerly for their having devoted themſelves to the Holy Miniſtry, for having Received the Title of being Chriſts Ambaſſadors to his Saints here on Earth.

Were they of any other Profeſſion, their Parts and Piety would make them to be much Regarded by all Men; but becauſe they have entred into the Office of the Holy Miniſtry, that Office which

which our Saviour did not disdain to take upon himself, and his Holy Apostles Gloried in, they must therefore suffer all Indignities and Affronts, and be Treated with greater Contempt and Ignominy than the meanest Artizan.

Is not this to Crucifie afresh the Lord of Life and Glory, to put him again to open shame, to Mock him, and to Spit upon him, as the Jews did before his Crucifixion? For whatever Indignity we offer to his Ministers here on Earth, he takes it as done to his own Person; *He that despiseth them, despiseth him that sent them.* It was this Respect alone which I have for the Ministerial Function, that moved me to Write these few Remarks upon a late Scurrilous Libel against our Clergy, Published by an obscure Anonymous Author, who seems to be more influenced by the Spirit of Malice and Envy, than of the Christian Religion. I was not a little concerned to see so many Eminent and Deserving Men thus injured in their Fame and Reputation, and that among Strangers to whom they were wholly unknown.

Were these Stories Published only in their own Country, where the whole course of their Life is sufficiently known, they might bid defiance to the utmost Malice of their Enemies; and to Answer any such malicious Libels against them there,

there, would be altogether ſuperfluous. But when theſe Reports are propagate amongſt Strangers, who have no perſonal knowledge of the Men who are thus abuſed, it is neceſſary to Write ſomething in their Vindication, and to prevent People's being farther impoſed upon by ſuch Lies and Calumnies.

This Author hath Writ a ſecond Part of the Treatiſe which is here Anſwered, but that being already taken to Task by another Hand, I take no Notice of it. My buſineſs is only with his firſt Pamphlet, wherein I have ſufficiently ſhewn his Groſs Prevarications and Falſhoods, and confuted all the Shadows of Reaſoning that lye ſcattered in his Book.

My preſent Circumſtances would not allow me to make an exact inquiry concerning all the particular Perſons whom he here Accuſes of Immoralities, I being at too great a diſtance from the Places where they do reſide. But I have pick'd out the moſt conſiderable inſtances; thoſe Perſons whom he charges with the moſt Atrocious Crimes, and in his Accuſations againſt them, I have evidently proved him guilty of the higheſt Malice and Injuſtice; which I think, is ſufficient to Ruin the Credit of his Book in the reſt of the Inſtances among all Sober and Judicious Men.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Introduction.

THE Uncharitableneſs and Inhumanity of this Author's Deſign. Pag. 1

This method of Writing inconſiſtent with the Principles of our Religion, and the Laws of Humane Society. 2

The occaſion of publiſhing the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence. 5

Chap. I.

THis Author's Reflections upon the Church of England, and ſome of the Miniſters of State, conſidered. Pag. 9

Epiſcopacy eſtabliſhed in Scotland, not by the force and tyranny of our Rulers, but by the conſent and approbation of the whole Nation. 10

The Biſhops in Scotland inveſted with full Authority belonging to Biſhops. 11

A ſhort account of ſome of our Church Judicatories, Kirk-Seſſions, Presbyteries, and Synods. Ibid.

Theſe Judicatories ſhown to be no Encroachment on the Epiſcopal Power. 12

Our Author's diſingenuity in his ſlanderous Reflections upon the Clergy. 13

Some few of the Epiſcopal Clergy offering to joyn with the Presbyterians, can be no ſufficient Vindication of the Lives and Morals of the Presbyterian Party. 14

The Epiſcopal Clergy have charged the Presbyterians with nothing relating to their barbarous Perſecution, but what they have been able to prove from irrefragable Authorities. 15

Epiſcopacy the firſt Government of the Church of Scotland after the Reformation, and never there by Law aboliſhed, till the unhappy Civil Wars under the Reign of K. Charles the First broke out. 16

The occaſion of ſetling Superintendents in the Church of Scotland upon the Reformation. 17

The Superintendents invested with the whole Episcopal Authority and Jurisdiction over the Clergy of their Dioceſſes. Pag. 18
The Miſſion of the Superintendents plainly different from that of other Miniſters. Ibid.
The Superintendents no ways Temporary as to their Office, but only as to the Name. 19
The Superintendents giving an account to a National Synod of their Diligence in their Functions, no Argument againſt their being Biſhops. 20
The Enacting of theſe Penal Laws againſt the Presbyterians, which this Author has craped together, occaſioned meerly by the frequent Rebellions of that Party. 21
The Nation had ſufficient ground to Enact theſe Laws againſt the Presbyterians, from their Treaſonable Practices under the former Reigns of K. James *the Sixth, and K.* Charles *the Firſt.* 22
That this was the true occaſion of Enacting theſe Penal Laws, appears from our Author's own Confeſſions. 23
It has been the conſtant practice of the Presbyterians to ſhelter their Treaſonable Deſigns under the Name of Religion. 24
The Sufferings of the Presbyterians no ways promoted by the Epiſcopal Clergy. 25
The Miniſters of State under K. Charles's *Government ſufficiently Vindicated from our Author's aſperſions of Cruelty.* 26
A ſhort Narrative of the Proceedings of the Council againſt ſome Miniſters turned out in 1662. 27

Chap. II.

THE *Presbyterians have juſtified the Murder of the Archbiſhop of* St. Andrews *in the face of Authority upon ſeveral occaſions.* Pag. 29
Mitchel's Execution juſtified. 30
The making the Inclinations of the People the Standart of the Church-Government, is of very fatal conſequence to the intereſt of Religion. Ibid.
The Presbyterians having made more Inſurrections in the Kingdom, in behalf of their Church-Government, than the Epiſcopal Church have thought fit to do, is no argument that Presbytery is more popular in Scotland *than Epiſcopacy.* 32
This laſt Convention having aboliſhed Epiſcopacy, and eſtabliſhed Presbytery, is no good argument, that the Presbyterians have the majority of the Nation on their ſide. 33
The Methods uſed by the Epiſcopal Clergy for reclaiming the Diſſenters ſeem to be very effectual, ſince at the time of K. James's *Indulgence there were few or no Presbyterians but what joyned in Communion with the Epiſcopal Church.*

The

The Presbyterian Practice in vilifying our Saviour's Prayer, altogether inexcusable. Pag. 35
The malicious Characters this Author gives of the English and Scots Gentry, as well as Clergy. 36
The setting or abrogating matters of Religion in compliance with the humours of the Populace, stands directly in opposition to the propagating of the Christian Religion. 37
The disingenuity of this Author and his Party in calling the English Common-Prayer-Book Popery. 39
The lawfulness of observing Anniversary Days of Humane Institution asserted. Ibid.
The Murder of K. Charles the First justly chargeable upon the Presbyterians in both Kingdoms, and not upon the Nation in general. 42
The behaviour of the Scots Presbyterians towards K. Charles the Second upon his advancement to the Throne. 46
That the English Convocation acted upon far better Grounds in refusing an Union with the Dissenters, than the Scots Assembly in rejecting the Addresses of those few Episcopal Clergy who addressed them, proved by several Reasons. 47
It is from the Civil Magistrate the Church derives all her Temporal Privileges, but he is in no wise the Fountain of Spiritual Power. 50
An account of the King's Supremacy in Scotland, as it is there Established by the Laws of the Kingdom. 52
The Church has the sole Power in Matters purely Spiritual, but the Clergy are equally subject to the Civil Authority, and liable to the same Punishments with the Laity. 53
The Papists and Presbyterians extend the Church's Authority beyond its true Bounds, in claiming an Exemption to the Clergy from Secular Punishments till they be first condemned by the Church. 54
The Church of England guilty of no breach of Promise, in refusing an Union with the Dissenters upon the Terms proposed. 56
The Presbyterian Ministers have often assumed to themselves a Power of making Peace and War. Ibid.
The Presbyterians not without some ground stigmatized with the Reproachful Term of New Gospellers. 57

Chap. III.

IT is not strange to see Persons, after they have murdered, robbed, or any way injured their Adversaries, to endeavour likewise to blacken them in their Fame and Reputation, the better to palliate their own wicked Actions against them. Pag. 58

The

The Contents.

The Innocency of our Clergy sufficiently Vindicated from this Libeller's Aspersions, since in this present Persecution against them by the Presbyterians they cannot instance in four of their Number, against whom they could find the least pretence to deprive them for Immoralities. Pag. 59

Many of our Clergy sufficiently Vindicated from this Libeller's accusations by the Author of an Appendix to a late Treatise, Entituled, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland. 60

Dr. Canaries fully Vindicated from the Calumnies brought against him by this Accuser, and the Accuser's malice and disingenuity fully detected. Ib.

An account of Dean Hamilton's Process, and his being absolved therefrom by the Privy-Council, and the Criminal-Court. 62

Our Author's great mistake concerning Mr. Boyd. 63

A full Relation of the Process concerning Mr. Hugh Blair, and of the indirect ways and means used by the Presbyterian Party to stain his Reputation. Ibid.

The Story of Mr. Chisholm truly related, and he cleared from this Calumny. 68

This Affair of Mr. Chisholm's, a singular Instance of the Villanous Arts and Practices of the Presbyterians to bring Contempt on the Episcopal Clergy. 71

Mr. Waugh a Presbyterian Minister vindicated from the aspersions of this Libeller. Ibid.

Another Mistake of our Author's, concerning Mr. Gregory's being Minister at Torbolton. 72

The notorious Falshood of the Relation about Mr. Pearson. Ibid.

A Vindication of Mr. Lawson Minister at Yrongray. 72

A Testimony of Archbishop Cairncross in favour of Mr. Lawson. 75

Another Testimony in his favour by the Presbytery of Dumfreis. 76

Archbishop Paterson his Letter, Vindicating himself from the Aspersions of this Libeller, Pag. 77, 78

A Vindication of Archbishop Cairncross. 80

Declaration of Mr. Richard Soot, and Mr. Henry Knox. 85

The Conclusion. 87

SOME

SOME

REMARKS

Upon the

ANSVVER

TO THE

Scots Presbyterian Eloquence.

In Vindication of the Clergy of Scotland, *from the Calumnies thrown upon them by the Author of that Pamphlet.*

WHEN I first Read the Answer to the *Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*, I confess I was perfectly amazed to think, that any sort of Men could be so Wicked as to shake off all ties of Humanity and Religion, and Write in this Scurrilous and most unchristian manner. This is such a method of Answering Books, as I believe was never yet heard of. The very Heathens and Infidels would blush at such Practices; and what an Age must this needs be in which our Lot is cast, that Christians, who profess to own that Pure and Holy Religion, should openly and avowedly Act such things as the most Barbarous Nations would be ashamed to commit. To Rake

The unchristianableness and inhumanity of the Authors design.

 toge-

together a parcel of Wicked and Prophane Stories, and to charge them upon Men, (moſt of whom are known to be of an untainted Fame and Reputation) and this without ſo much as one Witneſs to avouch for the Credit of what he ſays; this is ſuch a piece of Impudence and Villany, as is not eaſily to be parallel'd. Does our Author think, that his bare Authority in aſſerting theſe Lies and Aſperſions without any other proof, is ſufficient to blemiſh the Reputation of any Man of Worth and Credit? Or can he poſſibly imagine, that any Men of *Senſe* and Reaſon are ſo eaſily impoſed upon, as to believe theſe Calumnies to be true, unleſs he had been more particular in the circumſtances of time and place when moſt of theſe matters of Fact are ſaid to be done, and had produced the Teſtimony of ſome Famous and unexceptionable Witneſſes to evince the Truth of what he ſays? In the very beginning of his Pamphlet he declares himſelf an inveterate Enemy to the Church of *England*, and to the whole Epiſcopal Church of *Scotland*; and yet after he has thus Proclaimed an open Hoſtility, can he be ſo inconſiderate as to think, that any judicious or unbyaſſed Reader will give the leaſt Credit to what he ſays againſt the moſt obnoxious Member of their Society, unleſs he brings very clear and undeniable Evidence for his Aſſertions? It cannot be denied but that ſome two or three of thoſe Men whom our Author thus Libels in his Pamphlet, were obnoxious to cenſure in their Lives and Converſations; but it is very unreaſonable that the Vices of theſe particular Members ſhould be thrown upon the whole Society, ſince the Church did take all imaginable care to purge her ſelf of theſe Vicious and Corrupt Members, and did actually cenſure and depoſe for Scandals and Immoralities ſome of thoſe Clergy-men whom this Libeller here accuſes, but whether for thoſe Crimes he charges them with, I cannot poſitively aver. This I am ſure of, that the moſt Vicious of them, who were thus cenſured by the Church, could never be guilty of ſome of thoſe things alledged againſt them in this Pamphlet. Our Author in ſeveral of his inſtances has quite outdone his Malice, and has been ſo inconſiderate in the inventing of ſome of his Calumnies, that the bare Relation of the circumſtances of the Story is a ſufficient Confutation of the whole matter of Fact. For although a Man may be ſo Wicked, as to be guilty of that unnatural Act of Sodomy, yet unleſs he be in a Fit of madneſs to the higheſt Degree, 'tis hard to be imagined that he could either be ſo publick, or ſo indiſcreet in his Commiſſion of it, as to be convicted by 88 Witneſſes, as this Libeller would have us believe, *Pag.* 64. So imprudent is he, in contriving ſome of his Forgeries. For this is ſuch an Act of Folly and Imprudence, that I can hardly think any reaſonable Creature could be guilty of it; ſince not only the ſhame of his Crime, but likewiſe the danger of being capitally puniſhed

for

for it, would be ſufficient Motives, if not to terrifie him from the ſin, yet at leaſt to engage him to privacy in his Wickedneſs.

But as 'tis true, that ſome of the Clergy here Accuſed by our Author, have been guilty of ſome immoralities that cannot be excuſed; yet his other inſtances where he attempts to ſlander the Reputation of ſome innocent and worthy perſons are as notoriouſly falſe, as you ſhall ſee by and by when I come to conſider the ſeveral inſtances more particularly. However, I think theſe innocent Gentlemen are not in great hazard of ſuffering much in their Reputation by the malice of this Author; for his Pamphlet is all over ſtuffed ſo with the ſpirit of Gall and Bitterneſs, that his Teſtimony cannot be of any great weight among ſerious and ſober Men. He is not ſatisfied to belch out all his Vomit againſt the Clergy of both Nations; but he likewiſe Reflects upon all the Laity of the Epiſcopal perſwaſion both in *England* and *Scotland*, and repreſents them as Men void of all manner of Religion, who inſtead of frequenting the Religious Aſſemblies, *do haunt Bawdy-Houſes, and are Drunk in Taverns and Ale-Houſes.* Pag. 13.

And here I cannot forbear taking Notice of this Barbarous and Inhumane way of Writing, how deſtructive it is to all humane Society, and how inconſiſtent with the principles of that innocent and harmleſs Religion we all profeſs to maintain. It teaches us to be quite of another ſpirit, "To render no Man Evil for Evil, but to bleſs them that Curſe "us, and to pray for them that deſpitefully uſe us, and perſecute us. The Spirit of the Goſpel is ſo far from countenancing ſuch Wicked practices of Slandering and Reviling one another, that it requires us, when we know our Brother to be taken in an Offence, to endeavour to reclaim him in the ſpirit of meekneſs, by private and brotherly Admonitions. But alas! this New method of converting Sinners, which our New Goſpellers have taken up, is ſuch, that inſtead of reclaiming, it rather hardens and emboldens the Wicked in their Impieties.

This Method of Writing inconſiſtent with the Principles of our Religion, and the Laws of Humane Society.

I do ſeriouſly wiſh the Authors of ſuch Libels would but conſider a little the general intereſt of Religion, and bethink themſelves what advantage they afford the Enemies thereof by ſuch unchriſtian practices; for what a ſcandal muſt it needs prove both to Jews and Gentiles, againſt our moſt Holy Religion, when they ſee thoſe who profeſs to believe it, accuſing one another of ſuch groſs immoralities as could hardly be acted among any who firmly believe the Exiſtence of a Deity. They muſt needs be Tempted from ſuch practices to conclude, that all our Religion is a meer Cheat, and that we outwardly profeſs what we do not inwardly believe; ſince our behaviour towards one another is ſuch, as if we did not really believe there is a God in Heaven to reward the Good, or puniſh the Wicked Doer. Our Primitive Anceſtors uſed this as an Argument in be-

half of their Religion againſt the Heathens, that it was Pure and Holy, harmleſs and innocent, and that its Doctrine was more effectual in reclaiming Sinners from their Wicked Courſes, than the Principles and Dictates of all the Heathen Moraliſts. This they inſiſt much upon in their Apologies; and it was certainly one of the moſt ſucceſsful Arguments in making Converts to their Religion; for we find that by this Argument many Heathens were perſwaded to leave their Superſtitious Rites and Cuſtoms, and to embrace the Chriſtian Religion as the moſt Pure and Holy, and that which advanced the Principles of Humane Nature to the higheſt pitch. But can we ever expect at this rate to make any Converts to our Religion, when its Enemies do ſee us daily accuſing one another of ſuch Crimes as the moſt Barbarous Nations do abhor. Nay, ſo far are we from gaining any New Proſelytes thereby, that I'm confident this Practice of Libelling our brethren does tempt ſuch of our Religion as are not firmly perſwaded of the Truth thereof, to deſert and ridicule it. We may eaſily foreſee of what pernicious conſequence this Practice will at laſt prove, if we but conſider how greatly Atheiſm and Irreligion does already prevail among us Is it not the general Humour of but too many in theſe Nations to Laugh at all manner of Revelation as a meer Art of Prieſts to captivate and delude ſilly people? They look upon Religion as a thing mean and deſpicable, and far below the concern of ſuch great *Maſters of Reaſon*, as they pretend to be. Nay, we are come to ſuch an indifferency in matters of Religion, that many of our Laity do look upon it as a piece of Grandeur and Bravery, to trample upon all that's Sacred and ſtamp'd with a Divine Character. Don't we ſee them daily endeavouring to expoſe the Clergy to Ignominy and Reproach, to retrench and diminiſh their Revenues, to repreſent them as Abject and Vile Perſons, as the refuſe of all the people, and even to Rob them of thoſe Spiritual Priviledges with which our Saviour has inveſted them, and of which no Mortal can juſtly deprive them? And it is no ſmall encouragement that our New Libellers afford theſe open Prophaners of Religion to perſiſt in their Wicked courſes, of expoſing the Clergy and conſequently Religion it ſelf to Scorn and Deriſion; for unleſs the Clergy be had in that Eſteem and Reſpect by the *Laity* which their Sacred Function does require, 'tis impoſſible that ever Religion can flouriſh among us; they will never hearken to their Precepts, that have not a due Reverence for their perſons. So that, if we have any concern for Religion, we ought above all things to be tender in blemiſhing the Reputation of Clergy-men; ſince it tends ſo much to the detriment of Religion, and renders their Miniſtry altogether ineffectual among the people.

But

But this Method of Slandering and Reviling our Brethren is not only fatal to Religion, but is likewise destructive of all Humane Society. For where such practices are permitted, it must needs beget Rancour and Malice, Envy and Revenge among the people, and this will at last end in Blood and Confusion. The most innocent person can have no Fence for his Reputation against such Wicked practices as these; for suppose any prophane Ruffian should have the Malice to Accuse any of us of being Guilty of gross Immoralities in private, and offer no Witnesses to avouch for the Truth of his Accusations; what method can we propose in this Case to purge our selves from these Aspersions? For my part, I know no other way but to Appeal for our Innocency to the Testimony of those who are most acquainted with the whole Course of our Life and Actions. I wish the Author of this Pamphlet may Reflect a little upon the mischievous consequences of such Practices, and consider what mischief he does to Religion meerly to gratifie a little Humour.

The occasion of publishing the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence.

I know he endeavours to excuse himself by pretending that the Episcopal Party were the Aggressors, and that they were forced to use these Weapons only in their own defence. As for these few Reflexions on particular persons which are contained in that Discourse our Author pretends to Answer; I confess I never did approve them; but when I consider the occasion of Publishing this Treatise, I cannot deny but they had great provocation to what they did. When the Presbyterians were carrying on their Persecution against the Clergy of *Scotland*, it was their constant practice to summon them before their Courts of Judicature, and there produce Libels against them, containing all the false Accusations their Malice could possibly invent, of their being *Scandalous*, *Ignorant*, and *Erroneous in their Principles*, the Old Cant that was used against our Clergy, by the Presbyterians in their former Usurpation in both these Nations. These Libels were Read publickly in their Courts in the presence of a great many Spectators, and this on purpose to expose the Clergy to the greater Contempt among the Vulgar. The Persons thus Accused very patiently heard their Libels, and desired Witnesses might be adduced to prove the least matter of Fact there Libelled against them; and when they complained of this Barbarous way of proceeding, that a Court of Justice should suffer Libels to be Read before them without any Accuser to own, or any Witnesses to prove them; and only begged of their Judges that they might be allowed to Vindicate their Reputation, and to purge themselves from these Calumnies, by the Testimony of a few of their Neighbours of the best Fame and Repute; that so these malicious Lies might not be kept on Record as an Eternal Reproach to their Memory. This small favour was denied them, and

their

their Judges very civilly told them, they were not concerned to inquire into the Libels produced against them, (notwithstanding of which they caused them to be Read publickly in their Courts, that the Vulgar might have thereby Opportunity to mock and ridicule the Clergy; a most horrid Act of iniquity!) but only whether they had complied with the Civil Government, and given Obedience to the Acts of the *Convention* of Estates. And yet after they had declined to search into these Libels, they Ordered them to be inserted into the Registers of their Courts, as being one of the Grounds of the Deprivation of the Clergy, though not so much as ever Attempted to be proved; where they are still kept on Record, as a Publick Monument of Infamy and Disgrace to our Clergy; and the Author of this Pamphlet has the impudence to quote these Records as an Evidence against them. Now this is such a horrid and barbarous Act of Injustice, as I am confident, was never heard of among the most Barbarous Nations; and yet it is so certainly True, that I my self was Eye Witness to several instances of it, and dare Challenge the most impudent of their Party to disprove this matter of Fact as here Related.

The Presbyterians did not rest satisfied with their Attempts to render the Episcopal Clergy odious in *Scotland*, by their Unchristian Practices of inventing malicious Libels against them; but likewise at the same time they were Persecuting them at home, they industriously Printed and Dispersed Papers here in *England*, representing them as Men vicious in their Lives, and ignorant in their Profession. So that after all this Barbarous and Cruel Treatment which our Clergy suffered from the Presbyterians, it was no wonder that some of their Friends should be Tempted to Espouse their Quarrel, and to expose their Adversaries in their True and Natural Colours. But these kind of Practices where they are accompanied with Spite and evil Designs, I must needs own, ought to be approved of in neither Party: since the only Effect they have, is to propagate our Animosities and Divisions, and to enlarge our Breach so as to make it altogether incurable. However this may suffice to let you see the Presbyterians were the first Aggressors, and if they still persist to Write at this Scurrilous and Obscene Rate, 'tis to be feared they may provoke some Writers for the Episcopal Party to Fight them at their own Weapons, and then perchance they may have good Reason to be weary of such Practices.

The Design of this Treatise, which our Author pretends to have given him just occasion for writing in this obscene and calumniating manner, was not to blemish the Reputation of any particular Person, by reflecting on his Morals, or ripping up the Sores and Failings which any one may have

have chanced to be guilty of through the Infirmity of Humane Nature. No, this had been a most Unjustifiable and Unchristian Thing, since the Precepts of our Religion teach us to cover and conceal the Infirmities of our Brethren. And it were very unjust to Upbraid one that is a good Man now, with the Escapes to which the Frailty and Weakness of his Youth did expose him: We ought rather to rejoyce and glory in his Conversion, that through the Assistance of the Divine Grace he has been enabled at last to overcome all the Temptations of the Devil, the World, and the Flesh, and to rescue himself from the Paws of that *Roaring Lion, which goeth about seeking whom he may devour.* We are all of us, alas! but too much exposed to the Frailties and Infirmities of our Nature, and so have no great cause to Insult too much over the Failings of our Brethren; especially when they are so far from persisting in their wicked Courses, that they heartily repent of the Wickedness they have committed, and endeavour now to do that which is lawful and right, that they may save their Souls alive. And all the Instances in this Book, containing Personal Reflexions upon the Life or Morals of any, do not amount to above two or three, which I have ground to believe were slipt into the Book without the consent or privity of the Author. But the true design of this Discourse was, to inform the World what great Damage did accrue to Religion, by the ridiculous manner in which our Presbyterians are wont to handle all Matters that are Sacred; how they infuse into the Minds of the People sordid and mean Notions of the Great and Eternal God; how they often fright many into an unreasonable Despair of God's Mercy, by the horrid and extravagant Notions which they entertain of the great Mystery of our Redemption, and how by their ridiculous and nauseous Stuff which they vent in their Prayers and Sermons, they expose the Sacred Mysteries of our Religion to Scorn and Derision. And I think the doing of this is so far from being a Crime, that it is rather a Duty incumbent on us, to forewarn People of the fatal Consequences that such Methods must needs have among us; that all good Men, who have any real concern for Religion, being informed of these things, may contribute their Endeavours for preventing that Deluge of Atheism and Impiety, which has already begun to overflow these Nations, and may justly be imputed to the Principles and Practices which these kind of pretending Gospellers have propagated among us; and that being made sensible of the great Danger to which Religion by such Practices is exposed, may for the future discountenance all such Men as without any Commission from God do usurp the Authority of his Ambassadors, and by their Drollery and Ridicule prophane all that's Sacred. Yea, I doubt not but Charity, even to the *Presbyterian* Preachers themselves, partly moved

the

the Author to expose those extravagant Expressions in their Sermons and Books; according to that of St. *Augustin*, *Hæc tu misericorditer irride, ut iis ridenda ac fugienda commendes*; Do thou mercifully deride these Errors in Men, that thou mayest move themselves to deride and shun them.

This, methinks, is a pious and commendable Design enough; and if the Author of this pretended Answer had but followed this method, and offered to prove against the Episcopal Clergy, what some of their Writers have done to a Demonstration against the *Presbyterian* Sect, that in stead of Preaching the pure and sincere Word of God, they filled their Sermons and Instructions with nothing but nauseous Stuff and Nonsense; I say, could he have proved these Things against them, and had he abstained from his Calumniating Aspersions, his Vindication of his own Party would not have been so generally condemned. But being sensible of his Weakness on that side, and that any Assertions of that nature in Prejudice of our Clergy could be easily confuted, he was resolved to attack them in a more Revengeful manner, and to alledge Things against them, which, though most of them are as notoriously false as the other, yet he knew could not be so easily disproved. For in this case, as I said before, when a Man is accused of being guilty of some Scandals and Immoralities in his Life, and not the least Evidence brought to prove these Accusations; the only way left him to purge himself, is to appeal for his Innocency to the Testimony of those that have been most acquainted with the whole series and course of his Life. But had he offered to urge any thing against them relating to the Matter of their Doctrine and Sermons, he very well knew that was a thing too Publick and too Notorious to Falsifie in, and that they could bring a Cloud of Witnesses against him to declare, that they Preach nothing but the Pure and Sincere Gospel of Christ, and Administer his Sacraments with that Gravity and Sincerity that becomes the Infinite and Eternal Being, whom they represent here on Earth as his Ambassadors, and whose Covenants they seal in his Name; that they never approach the Throne of God but with the greatest Reverence and Devotion, declaring by the outward Prostration of their Body, what great and noble Thoughts they entertain of their Almighty Creator, and of the Sacred Offices they are about.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

HAving thus given you my Thoughts very freely of the General Design of this Pamphlet, I shall in the next place trouble you with a few Remarks on the Particulars contained therein. As for our Author's Dedication, which, I suppose, he designs for a piece of Wit, I can discern nothing in it but what is mean and silly. His malicious Reflexions upon that Prelate, whom he so scurrilously Treats in his Dedication, and elsewhere, are nothing but a meer *Brutum fulmen*, and cannot in the least wound the Reputation of so great a Man, he being a Person endued with such excellent Parts, and his Merit having advanced him to such a Character in the Church, that it puts him far beyond the reach of the greatest Malice of any such Scribler. In his Preface, he very civilly Compliments those Members of the Church of *England*, who promoted the Design of the Comprehension with the Dissenters, and tells them, that in his many Reflexions on the Church of *England*, he does not intend them, but *understands only that Faction which opposed His Majesties desire of Uniting his Subjects, and goes under the Title of Ceremony-Mongers.* It were to no purpose to relate here the many venomous and ill-natured Reflexions on the Church of *England*, which are scattered in all the Pages of this Pamphlet. But by what he says in his *Preface*, we may plainly see, that he declares War against the most considerable part of the Church, as being Enemies to all Religion, and betrayers both of our Religious and Civil Rights. And although he's pleased to call them a *Faction* only of the Church, yet he must own them to be such a Faction as are the greatest part, and consequently the fullest Representative of the Society, since by their Interest in the House of Convocation they opposed the Alterations that were then designed to be made in our Offices.

This Author's Reflexions upon the Church of England, and some of the Ministers of State, considered.

In the same Paragraph he inveighs bitterly against the Chief Ministers of State here in *England*, who, upon the Application of some of the Episcopal Clergy to this Government, were pleased, out of a Compassionate sense of their Miseries and Oppression, to espouse their Interest, and endeavour to procure them a Redress of their Grievances. These Men he represents, as having been formerly *Instruments to bring us under Popery and Slavery*; and whether this be not such a Reflexion on the present Government, as does concern it to Punish severely, I leave my Reader to judge, since to accuse the Chief Ministers of State under any Government of

such odious Crimes as *Enslaving their Country*, is a direct Insinuation against the Government it self, as if it, by employing such kind of Instruments, did really design those Mischiefs against the Nation, with which they upbraid their Chief Ministers of State. And here I cannot enough admire the Impudence of this Author, to quarrel with the *English* Peers for medling in the Affairs of the Church of *Scotland*, when he very well knows, that the greatest Encouragement and Support the *Presbyterian* Party in that Kingdom have, is from the influence of some foreign *Presbyterians*. And I would gladly know why an *English* Nobleman has not as good Right to concern himself in the Affairs of our Church, as any *Dutch Presbyterian*.

Episcopacy established in Scotland, not by the force and Tyranny of our Rulers, but by the consent and approbation of the whole Nation.

But to take off all Church of *England* men from having any Pity or Compassion upon the Distressed State of our Church, he endeavours to perswade them, that the Constitution of Episcopacy in *Scotland* is so very far different from that of *England*, that although our Clergy are Sufferers for the Primitive and Apostolical Government of Episcopacy by Law established in that Nation, yet they cannot be said to suffer for the Government and Discipline of the Church of *England*, and so not deserve that Fellow-feeling and Countenance which some worthy Members of her Communion are pleased to shew them. His first Instance, to shew the difference betwixt the two Constitutions, is this, That *ours in* Scotland *was forced upon us by the Tyranny of our Rulers*. Now suppose his Assertion were true, yet, methinks, 'tis a very odd consequence, that two Constitutions must needs be different in their Nature, because different means were used to settle them in a Nation. Could not the *Tyranny of our Rulers* have forced upon us the same Constitution with that of *England*, as easily as one that is different. But his Assertion is as notoriously false, as the Consequence he endeavours to draw from it; for in the Infancy of the Reformation our Church was governed by Bishops and Superintendents, and that form of Government was approved of by the Unanimous Consent of the whole Nation, both Clergy and Laity *. And as to these later Times, our publick Records of Parliament can yet testifie, that the Episcopal Government was so far from being forced upon the Nation against their Will and Consent, that it has been established and confirmed by Twenty seven successive Legal Parliaments. It's known that at the Restoration of the Royal Family, the whole Nation having long groaned under the Yoke of *Presbytery*, they were very desirous to have their Primitive and Ancient Government of Episcopacy restored, that they might be rescued from the Tyranny and Confusion of the Presbyterian Anarchy, under which they had so severely smarted during their Usurpation; and a great many of the Clergy, I am sure the whole Diocese of *Aberdeen* almost to a Man, addressed His Majesty upon this account. His

* Anno 1572. Parl. 3 Jac. 6. c. 45, 46, &c. and Perth Ass. in Aug. 1572.

His next Instance is, *That Presbytery being Engrafted with our Reformation, Prelacy could never attain to a kindly nor plenary Possession:* And to prove this, he instances in our retaining of *Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries,* and *Synods,* even under Bishops. That the Presbyterian Government had no Settlement in our Church for many Years after the Reformation, I shall hereafter prove, to the conviction of the most Obstinate. But that Presbyters had a great Hand in Reforming us from the Errors and Superstitions of the *Romish* Church, both in *Scotland* and other Nations where the Reformation happily prevailed, is what we do not deny. But does it hence follow, that because Presbyters were more instrumental than Bishops in Promoting that great Work of the Reformation, that therefore the Presbyterian Government ought to be Established wherever the Reformation obtains, and that of Episcopacy overturn'd? Or because Presbyters had the Happiness to be concerned in so good a Work, does that therefore Authorize them to Usurp the Sacred Office of a Bishop, without being duly Called and Ordained thereto, by those whom our Saviour has appointed to convey that Authority? Although some Bishops may chance to be backward and negligent in doing their Duty, as those Popish Bishops who opposed the Reformation, yet 'tis altogether unreasonable that the whole Order should suffer for the Crimes of some particular Members of their Fraternity. What our Author means, by saying, Episcopacy never attained to a *Plenary Possession* among us, I do not well apprehend; for 'tis plain the Constitution of our Episcopacy is such, that the Bishop is Invested with the sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction within his own particular District; the whole Presbyters of his Diocese are subject to his Authority, and own him for their Chief Governor in Matters purely Spiritual; there is no Act of Discipline put in execution by the Inferior Clergy, but by the Allowance and Approbation of their *Diocesan*; and I think this is such a full and plenary Possession as may justly entitle them even to a *through Settlement.*

The Bishops in Scotland *invested with the full Authority belonging to Bishops.*

As for his Instances of our *Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods Provincial and National,* because this is a part of our Constitution not so very well known here in *England,* I shall trouble my Reader with this short account of them. That which he calls the *Kirk-Session,* is a Court of Judicature established in every Parish, consisting of the Minister and some few Laicks of good Reputation that are his Parishioners, whom he associates to himself for giving him information of the Manners and Conversation of his People, that so he receiving from these Men exact Information of the state of his Parish, all scan-

A short account of some of our Church Judicatories, Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods.

dalous and vicious Persons may be brought to condign Punishment. The *Presbyteries* are a sort of Judicatory under the Episcopal Constitution, consisting meerly of the Clergy; for every Diocese is divided into several Presbyteries, each of which consist of about 12 Ministers or thereby, some of them being more numerous than others. This Judicatory meets at least once a Month, and their chief business is, to consult and advise about Affairs relating to their several Churches, and to examine the Qualifications of those that design to enter upon the Holy Ministry, the Bishop never admiting any to Holy Orders, but such as have their Approbation after several Exercises done before them. If there happen any Matter of great Consequence and Importance in any Parish, which the Minister is not willing to meddle in without the Advice of his Brethren, he brings it before this Judicatory, and laying open the whole matter to them, desires their Counsel and Direction how to proceed in such a weighty Affair, of Punishing an obstinate Offender who refuses to submit to the Censures of the Church. This kind of Judicatory was not indeed known in our Church till near 20 Years after the Reformation. The *Synod* is a Convocation of the whole Clergy of a Diocese, with their Bishop, who meet twice every Year to consult about Matters relating to their own particular Province. *National Synods*, commonly called *General Assemblies*, (consisting of all the Bishops and their Deans, together with the Moderators of the several Presbyteries in their respective Dioceses, and one Commissioner from each Presbytery joyned with the Moderator,) are called by the King *Pro re natâ*, to Deliberate concerning the Affairs of the whole National Church. In the *Provincial Synods*, the Bishop takes care to examine, if the several Presbyteries be diligent in their Duty of Punishing Offenders; and if any of the Clergy be obnoxious to Censure, here they are Prosecuted for their Mildemeanors.

These Judicatories shewn to be no Encroachment on the Episcopal Power.

Now these Judicatories are so far from being prejudicial to the Bishops Power, that they are rather a great Assistance to them for promoting the Discipline of the Church, and upon that account were first Erected with the Consent and Allowance of the Bishops themselves, they judging it very proper and convenient not to do any thing of great consequence to Religion, without asking the Advice of their Clergy how they should behave themselves in a Matter of so great Importance. And these Courts could not be look'd upon as any Encroachment upon the Episcopal Power, since they so entirely depended on the Bishops Authority, that without his Consent no Act of theirs could be valid. But I think truly the Discipline

of

of our Church is none of the things most to be blamed; for we have some remains of the Primitive Discipline as yet among us, which are to be found but in few National Churches at this day, as appears from the Vestige we have of that Ancient custom of *Communicatory Letters* among the Bishops of the Primitive Church. And, as there is some Resemblance of it amongst our Bishops, by dimissory Letters; so it was still in force among the Inferior Clergy, who were obliged to receive none into their Congregations, till they first brought Certificates from the Minister in whose Parish they formerly Lived, testifying, that during their residence among his Flock, they had behaved themselves Christianly and Soberly, and that he knew nothing against them, why they might not be admitted into any Christian Congregation; without this they were never allowed to have the benefit of the Sacraments. Had not the Presbyterians by their Tumults and Commotions envied us the happiness of having the English Liturgy settled among us, the Constitution and Discipline of our Church was such, as made us inferiour to few National Churches. And here I cannot but wonder at the Impudence of that Party, that although they refused to joyn in Communion upon any Terms with the Episcopal Church, as by Law Established; yet they would take upon them to hinder them from settling among the Members of their own Communion, such a Form of Worship as they thought most agreeable to the Word of God, and consonant to the practice of the Primitive Church.

Our Authors disingenuity in his slanderous Reflexions upon the Clergy.

Our Authors transient Reflexions upon the Clergy are dressed up in such Scurrilous and Obscene Language, as must needs make any Man of a Virtuous Education blush to Read them; and therefore lest I should offend the Ears of the modest Reader by Repeating them, I shall pass them over in silence, till I come to consider his Third Part, and at present only take Notice of those things in the Book which relate either to matter of Argument or matter of Fact. And here I cannot omit his great protestations of his *Ingenuous and fair Dealing* in this Work, whereby he thinks the more easily to captivate unthinking Readers into a belief of his Lies and Calumnies. He pretends *to have inserted nothing but what he has Received from Credible Hands*, but he thinks it not fit to gratifie his Reader with an Account of the Names of those *Credible Persons* whose Authority he avouches for the Truth of his Aspersions. Had he given us the Names of the persons, with attested Declarations under their hands, asserting the Truth of these things alledged against some of our Clergy, we could have then known of what Credit and Authority the

the Teſtimony of thoſe Perſons ought to be had, and it had been an eaſie matter to convince the World of the Falſehood and Forgery of his Calumnies, and to purge thoſe innocent perſons from the Slanders caſt upon them, out of meer Malice and Envy. But as for our Authors *Ingenuity* in his Collection, he has ſcraped together a great many Stories, many of which are moſt notoriouſly Falſe, and have not the leaſt ſhadow of Truth in them, as I ſhall afterwards make appear; and for the proof of ſome of them, he Appeals to Records, where no ſuch thing is extant or to be ſeen, as I have had particular occaſion to enquire. Some of his Accuſations are againſt ſuch of the Clergy, as were either Suſpended, or Depoſed by the Church for their Immoralities, and yet this Author imputes the Faults of theſe Men to the whole Society, and is ſo disingenuous as not to acquaint his Reader with the Cenſures paſſed upon them by the Church. Others again are Paſſages related of ſome Clergy-men, who Lived under the Presbyterian Government, during the times of its laſt Uſurpation in that Kingdom, which this Author is pleaſed to charge upon the preſent Epiſcopal Church, and whether this be *Fair and Ingenuous Dealing*, I appeal to any unbyaſſed Reader.

Some few of the Epiſcopal Clergy offering to joyn with the Presbyterians, can be no ſufficient Vindication of the Lives and Morals of the Presbyterian Party.

This Author inſiſts much upon the Addreſs preſented to their General Aſſembly, by ſome of the Epiſcopal Clergy, deſiring to be admitted into a ſhare of their Church Government. This he urges as a ſufficient Vindication of the Lives and Morals of the Presbyterians, or at leaſt as an Argument that theſe Epiſcopal Addreſſers were *no Honeſt Men themſelves, who deſired to be aſſociated with ſuch Knaves as they give the Presbyterians out for.* This Addreſs was oppoſed by a great part of the Church of *Scotland*, moſt of them looking upon it as unlawful and altogether inconſiſtent with the Principles of Chriſtian Communion, to joyn any ways in Communion with thoſe whom they owned to be notorious Schiſmaticks, as long as they perſiſted in their Schiſm; ſo that it was but a few of the Clergy that were concerned therein, and this they urge in their own Defence. That notwithſtanding the Nation was in a diſtracted State and Condition, yet it concerned every individual Chriſtian, eſpecially Clergy-men, to lend their Aſſiſtance for the puniſhing of Scandalous and Vicious Perſons, and therefore, that although the Presbyterians had Uſurped the Government of the Church; yet the Epiſcopal Clergy, who ſtill retained poſſeſſion of their Churches, might, conſiſtently enough with their Principles, joyn with them in the puniſhing of contumacious Offenders; eſpecially, ſince they were

were not obliged by this Act of Union, to concur with them in their Presbyterian Ordinations, or to own their Authority in matters purely Spiritual; but only to Unite with them as a Company of Laicks impowered by the State to Inflict censures upon obstinate Sinners. These were the Terms proposed to them by the Civil Government for carrying on this Union, and this they think they might have lawfully done, without owning so much as the validity of their Ministry; and I am sure, much more without being obliged either to approve of, or to enquire into their Lives and Conversations; since in matters of Religion the bad Lives of Christians is never a sufficient Ground for separating from their Communion, if it be in all other Respects lawful.

The Episcopal Clergy have charged the Presbyterians with nothing relating to their Barbarous Persecution, but what they have been able to prove from irrefragable Authorities.

The design of the first part of this Pamphlet is to shew, That *the Episcopal Party bear an inveterate Malice against the Presbyterians, and therefore their Testimony ought not to be of any Authority in these Accusations which they bring against them.* But our Author, if his Spirit of Revenge had not been too predominant, might have saved himself all this trouble, since the Episcopal Party do not offer to urge any thing against them upon their own bare Authority, but what they can evidently prove from Authentick Records, and from the Attestations of Men of unspotted Fame and Credit, who were Eye-Witnesses to many of the Villanies and Injuries done to our Clergy. And this I am certain, they have already done beyond the possibility of a Confutation in the *Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, and some other Discourses which they have Published relating to their late Barbarous Persecution. *Late* I ought not to call it, since it Rages almost as much now as ever. It's true, the Clergy are not so much exposed to the Rage and Fury of the Rabble, as they were (by whose instigation is very well known) not very long ago. But their Miseries are far from being at an end; they still remain in Exile from their Churches and Houses, are exposed to all the Miseries of Poverty and Want, have not the least means of subsistence whereby they may gain Bread to satisfie their crying starving Infants; their Miseries do daily increase upon them, and which is most discouraging, they have no prospect of Deliverance. I pray God may enable them patiently to undergo this Fiery Tryal, to withstand all the Temptations of Interest and Worldly Politicks, and to remain firm and stedfast in asserting those Principles of our Religion, for which they at present suffer; that so having no other aim before their Eyes, but to keep a Conscience void of Offence, both towards God and Man, they may have a well grounded hope of Receiving at last, as a

Reward

Reward of their Sufferings, that Eternal Crown of Glory which Christ hath purchased to all those that suffer for *well doing*.

Episcopacy the first Government of the Church of Scotland *after the Reformation, and never there by Law Abolished till the unhappy Civil Wars under the Reign of K.* Charles *broke out.*

But let us pursue our Authors Thread of Discourse, and see what the Grounds are whereon he Accuses the Episcopal Party, with inveterate Malice against the Presbyterians. And the first instance we meet with of this kind, is, *That they were the First Aggressors, and impugned the Government of the Church of* Scotland *by Presbytery, which was the first it had after the Reformation.* It is not a little surprizing to see what pains the Presbyterians take to delude the ignorant people into a belief, That our first Reformers Condemned and Exploded the Ancient Government of the Church; and that it was no less Odious to them than the Romish Superstitions. When there is nothing more plain from History, than that at the beginning of the Reformation, there was not the least Controversie about the Church Government, and the Bishops who did not oppose the Reformation, were left in full possession, not only of all their Temporal Dignities, but likewise of their Spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction. Such of the Bishops as persisted in the Romish Errors and Corruptions, were not allowed to Exercise their Spiritual Authority over the Clergy, but some of the Reformed Communion, under the Name of Superintendants, were placed over their Dioceses, and invested with the whole Episcopal Jurisdiction and Authority over the Clergy of these Provinces, who were obliged (as appears from the Acts of our National Synods*) to pay to their Superintendents, all the Canonical Obedience that is due to other Bishops. And by a Commission of the Assembly met at *Leith* in *January* 1572, the Government of the Church was declared to be in the Arch-bishops and Bishops, and their Elections to be made by the Dean and Chapter; which Declaration was ratified by Act of Parliament the same year, and likewise by a General Assembly held at *Perth* in *August* thereafter. Till the year 1575, about fifteen years after the Legal settlement of our Reformation, there was not the least disturbance in the Kingdom about the Government of the Church, that *Mr. And. Melvil* returning from *Geneva*, where he had been bred up with the Presbyterian Parity, began to raise Commotions in the Church, by attempting to have the *Geneva* Model Established in *Scotland*. But a fuller Account of the Government of our Church after the Reformation, you may see in a Treatise Published by Arch-bishop *Spotswood* upon this Subject, and Entituled *Refutatio Libelli de Regimine Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*; and likewise in a late Discourse, where the same Argument is at Large considered, and in which it

*Spotsw. Refut. Libel. de Reg. Eccl. Scot. p. 21.

Ibid. p. 26.

* *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 18.*

is

is undeniably proved from the Records of Parliament, that Episcopacy was not only the first Government Established in our Church, immediately upon the Reformation, but what is more, that although the Episcopal Authority was frequently Weakned and Interrupted by the popular Insurrections of the Presbyterian Party; yet it was never by Law Abolished in that Kingdom, till the unhappy Civil Wars broke out under the Reign of King *Charles* I.

In the year 1592, when they pretend their great Idol of Parity was Erected, there was indeed a greater Jurisdiction and Authority allowed by Act of Parliament to *Presbyteries* and *Synods*, than what was Granted them before, which the King was forced to yield to, to put a stop to the many Seditions and Commotions raised by *Melvil* and his Accomplices. But yet notwithstanding this, the Bishops did still continue to exist by Law, and in all Parliaments they did Sit and Vote as the first of the three Estates, as appears from the Records of these Parliaments. And in the year 1596. *Leslie* Bishop of *Ross* dying at *Brussels*. Mr. *David Lindsay* was presented by the King to the Bishoprick the very next year; which is a plain demonstration that at that time Episcopacy was look'd upon as existent by Law; all which is made out very plainly and evidently in this Apology,

The occasion of settling Superintendants in the Church of Scotland upon the Reformation.

But our Author will by no means allow the *Superintendency* Established in the Church by our first Reformers, to be a Species of Prelacy. And his Reasons are; first, That *those Superintendents had the very same Form of Ordination with other Ministers.* Before I proceed to consider the force of this Objection, it will be needful to premise something concerning the occasion of this Institution. At the beginning of the Reformation it was not thought safe, that the Popish Bishops, who still adhered to their Errors and Superstitions, should be allowed to exercise their Spiritual Jurisdiction in the Church, and therefore they were excluded therefrom, and others of the Reformed Communion, being Vested with Episcopal Authority, were surrogated in their stead, and called by the Name of *Superintendents*; the Sees of the Popish Bishops not being Esteemed void, but supplied by Protestant Superintendents, who did not enjoy any of the Temporal Priviledges and Honours annexed to the Bishopricks. For although the Popish Bishops were restrained from the exercise of their Spiritual Power, yet such respect was had to them; that they were allowed during their Lives to possess all the Revenues of their Bishopricks, and to Sit and Vote in Parliament as Peers of the Realm. But such of the Bishops as went along with

the Reformation, were allowed, not only to enjoy all their Temporal Priviledges, but likewiſe to exerciſe their Spiritual Authority in the Church, and no Superintendants Named for their Dioceſes, as was for thoſe of the Popiſh Biſhops.

The Superintendants inveſted with the whole Epiſcopal Authority and Juriſdiction over the Clergy of their Dioceſes.

Now, although we ſhould grant our Author, that their Form of Ordination was not different; yet it cannot be denied, that they were inveſted with the whole Epiſcopal Authority and Juriſdiction over the Clergy of their ſeveral Dioceſes, which is the only *Bugbear* in Epiſcopacy, with which the Presbyterians pretend to Quarrel, becauſe they *Uſurp Lordſhip and Dominion over their Brethren*, They were cloathed with full Power of Ordaining Presbyters, of Suſpending and Depoſing them from their Sacred Function, of cenſuring and puniſhing the Clergy, according to their ſeveral Crimes; and all this they were Authorized to do * without asking the Advice, or Conſent of the reſt of the Clergy, which is more than our Biſhops at preſent do. ‖ All Appeals from Presbyters and the Inferiour Clergy, were to be made to the *Superintendents*; they were to decide all Controverſies in the Diſcipline of the Church, to preſide in Synods, and to direct the Church Cenſures inflicted by the reſt of the Clergy. All the Presbyters within their Dioceſes were required, under the pain of *Depoſition* to be ſubject to their Government and Authority; and were not allowed without the conſent and approbation of the *Superintendents*, to tranſact any thing of moment in the Church. So that they were inveſted with the whole Power and Juriſdiction that belongs to Biſhops; and this, methinks, ſhould be enough to ſtop the Mouths of the Presbyterian Party, who (as I have already ſaid) exclaim againſt nothing in this Sacred Order, but the Authority which Biſhops are allowed to have over the reſt of the Clergy.

* Spotſw. Refut. p. 321.

† Aſs. at St. Johnſtoun Seſs. 2. July 26. 1563.

The miſſion of the Superintendants plainly different from that of other Miniſters.

And as for their *Ordination*, it ſeems at leſt, that it was different from that of other Miniſters, ſince thoſe who were Nominated to be *Superintendants*; were choſe out of the Number of ſuch, as had already received the Orders of a Presbyter, and yet upon their Election to a *Superintendency*, they were again ſolemnly ſet apart by Prayer for that Office. Now it cannot be imagined, that they ſhould again receive the ſame Orders of a Presbyter, which had been already conferred upon them; and therefore this ſecond Miſſion, mentioned upon their being choſe Superintendents, can be meant of nothing elſe but Epiſcopal Conſecration, or ſomething in the ſenſe of the Church at that time, equivalent to it. They had long before received the Ordination of Presbyters; and now when

when they were Elected Superintendents, they were set apart for that Office, by certain solemn Rites and Ceremonies, which is a plain Demonstration, that they were in a manner Consecrated anew to that Sacred Function. Besides, it is not to be conceived, how they above other Presbyters, could be invested with this Power of conferring Orders, and exercising other Acts of Jurisdiction which belong only to Bishops, unless it were by having this Episcopal Authority conferred upon them, by the hands of other Bishops, and this they could without any difficulty obtain, from the hands of those Bishops in *Scotland*, who had imbraced the Reformed Communion. However, it is not peremptorily said here; that the Ordination of Superintendents to the Episcopal Office, was altogether Canonical: It is enough for our purpose, that they being of new, solemnly set apart for a more eminent Office in the Church, The Clergy and Laity had such a regard for the Episcopal Order, That they considered the Superintendents as such; and payed the same deference to them, that formerly was due to the Bishops: so that, tho their distinct Ordinations would not be made evident from History to be Canonical; yet their Power was undoubtedly Episcopal.

Hi, in Ministrorum ordinem ante coaptati, ad hoc προσταγίος munus solennibus auspiciis destinabantur, destinati eligebantur, electi functionem inibant. Spotsw. Ref. Libel. *p.* 3.

There is nothing more notoriously false, than what this Author urges in the second place against the Superintendents, That *their Office was Temporary during the Exigence of the Church.* For in the Form of Church Policy, which the Protestant Clergy offered to the Parliament in the year 1561, one of its Heads is concerning *Superintendents*, and it is there appointed, that the Election of Superintendants in after times, should be stricter than the present circumstances would allow; and the last Head of that Policy prescribes some conditions to be kept in future Elections of *Superintendents*; which is an evident proof, that our first Reformers did not look upon the Office of *Superintendents* only as a Temporary thing. The Name I grant indeed to have been temporary, and to have lasted no longer in the Church, than during the Natural Lives of the Popish Bishops. For while they were alive, their Bishopricks with respect to their Temporalities, were not esteemed vacant; and the Protestants who were set over their Dioceses, were called by the Name of *Superintendents*; they not being invested with the Temporal Priviledges of a Bishop, but only with the spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction belonging to that Office; but upon the Death of the Popish Bishops, we find, that whosoever was presented to any of these Dioceses now falling void by their Death, they

The Superintendants no ways temporary as to their Office, but only as to the Name. Spotsw. Hist. *p.* 150, 160.

were not presented under the Name of *Superintendents*, as they had been formerly, while the Popish Bishops were alive; but had now the Title of *Bishops* given them, and were invested with all the temporalties, annexed to the Bishopricks. Thus it is we find in the Infancy of the Reformation, both Bishops and Superintendants contemporary in the Church; but in a few years after, we have no mention of *Superintendents*, and all the Governours of the Church go under the Name of *Bishops*. And this, I should think, were enough to convince any unbyassed Reader, that in those days the Office of Episcopacy and Superintendency were both the same.

The Superintendants giving an Account to a National Synod of their diligence in their Functions, no Argument against their being Bishops.

The Third Argument which he brings against the Superintendents, is, That *they were accountable to the Presbyters, which is altogether inconsistent with Episcopacy.* Although Bishops at their first Institution, were invested with an Absolute Power over their Flocks, independent of any Authority, but that of Jesus Christ their Head, and were accountable to none for their right Administration of their Office but to him alone. Yet in after Ages, by a mutual compact among themselves, they did agree, that for the better preserving the Unity and Discipline of the Church; each Bishop should be accountable for his Administration to the whole Colledge of Bishops. And therefore although the Bishops should yield up some of their Right, and for the entertaining the better correspondence with the Clergy of their Dioceses, condescend to give them an Account of their diligence in the Offices of their Function, yet this could not be supposed to degrade them of their Office, or make them to be *no Bishops*. We grant, that the Superintendents did yearly give an Account of their Diligence in their Functions to a National Synod; but this Synod consisted of none but the Superintendents, and Bishops of the other Dioceses, and of the most Eminent of the Presbyters, who were allowed by the Superintendants, to sit in that Meeting. * There was no Minister permitted to be a Member of that Synod, till he was first approved of, by the Superintendants, as a person fitly qualified to judge of such matters as were brought before that Assembly. And I would willingly know of this Author, whether the Superintendants were any more accountable to this National Synod, than the Bishops who went along with the Reformation, and notwithstanding of this their being accountable, were still looked upon as Bishops, and left in full possession of all their Temporal and Spiritual Rights, which they enjoyed before the Reformation? And if those Men, who were acknowledged on all hands to be Bishops, were as much accountable

Spotsw. Refut. p. 22.

as

as the Superintendents; then it is no Argument that the latter were no Biſhops.

The next inſtance which this Author brings of the Epiſcopal Party, their bearing an *inveterate Malice* againſt the Presbyterians, is a long Enumeration of the Laws and Statutes made by King *Charles* II. and his Parliaments, for ſuppreſſing the many Seditions and Rebellions raiſed againſt his Government by the Presbyterian Faction. He ſums up all the Acts of Parliament made againſt that Rebellious Crew; and theſe he highly aggravates, as the greateſt inſtances of Cruelty in any Government. But as to this point, the Learned and Worthy Sir *George Mackenzie* has quite ſtopt the Mouths of this clamouring Party, by his excellent Treatiſe, wrote in defence of the proceedings of the Government of K. *Charles* II. againſt the Presbyterian Diſſenters. He has there given us a ſummary account of the mild and calm Methods uſed by the Government to reclaim this obſtinate Party, who were even hardned in their Rebellious Principles. He ſhews, that the enacting of theſe Penal Laws againſt them (which this Author has ſcraped together) was nothing but what the Governours of any Nation would have been, out of abſolute neceſſity, forced to do for its ſafety and ſecurity. He has collected the moſt conſiderable of the pretended inſtances of Cruelty againſt particular perſons, which the Presbyterians do now moſt grievouſly complain of, and do moſtly inſiſt upon in their Railings and Belchings againſt the Government. To all theſe inſtances he has given ſuch a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer; that every impartial Reader muſt needs own and acknowledge, that theſe perſons met with no ſeverity, but what their Rebellious and Treaſonable Actings againſt the Government did juſtly deſerve; that the puniſhments inflicted upon them, for their open and avowed deſigns of ſubverting the Monarchy, were conform to the Laws of the Nation, and the proceedings in their Tryals very fair and legal; and that the Methods of proceeding in our Criminal Courts of *Scotland*, (which this Author ſo groſly belies *pag.* 30. 31.) are the faireſt and juſteſt, and the Pannals indulged the greateſt advantages for their own defence, of any Nation in *Europe*. All which he has clearly demonſtrated to the conviction of every diſintereſſed perſon; who upon Reading the Hiſtory of theſe times will be apt to ſay, that the mildneſs and clemency of that Government towards the Rebellious Sectaries was its greateſt *Cruelty*. So that it is but Labour in vain, for this Author to be ſo full and copious, in relating theſe ſufferings of his Party, unleſs he can diſprove what Sir *George Mackenzie*, and others

The Enacting of theſe Penal Laws againſt the Preſbyterians which this Author has ſcraped together, occaſioned meerly by the frequent Rebellions of that Party.

* *Vindication of the Government in Scotland, during the Reign of K. Charles II.*

others have demonſtrated againſt them, of their being guilty of ſuch frequent Seditions and Rebellions againſt the State, as would have provoked the mildeſt Government on Earth, to have quite extirpated them. But all the Attempts which either this Author, or another, who pretends to Anſwer the *Vindication of K.* Charles II. *Government*, makes that way, are only ſome weak efforts upon Sir *George*'s perſonal Fame and Reputation, which are founded upon ſuch a Rock, as the greateſt Malice of this party is not able to undermine. His admirable qualities of Learning, Loyalty and Religion, have ſo juſtly recommended him to the Favour and Eſteem of all Virtuous and Ingenious Men, that for theſe *Scriblers* to Attempt the blemiſhing of his Fame, is to as little purpoſe, as the Dogs barking at the Moon.

The Nation had ſufficient ground to enact theſe Laws againſt the Presbyterians, from their treaſonable practices under the former Reigns of K Ja. 6. *and K.* Ch. I.

What this Author alledges againſt Sir *George*'s ingenuous dealing in his Vindication, *of Printing ſome Fanatical Covenants and Declarations, publiſhed by the Presbyterians, and the urging theſe as a ground for enacting thoſe ſevere Laws againſt them; although the Laws were made long before the publiſhing of theſe Declarations*; I ſay, what he alledges on this ſcore is moſt notoriouſly falſe. For theſe Covenants and Declarations, were only annexed to Sir *George*'s Vindication of the Government by the Publiſher, and that with deſign to let the World ſee, with what impudence this Party did accuſe the Government of ſeverity, when it appears from their own Authentick Declarations, that they were ſtill perſiſting obſtinately in their Wicked and Rebellious Practices againſt the State. There was no neceſſity of recurring to theſe Poſteriour Declarations of Rebellion, to juſtifie the making of theſe Laws againſt the Presbyterians; ſince their former Treaſonable Actings, under the Reigns of K. *James* VI. and K. *Charles* I. were ſufficient grounds to direct the Wiſdom of the Nation, to enact ſuch Laws as might tend moſt to ſuppreſs the ſedition of Rebels, and ſecure the Peace and Quiet of the Kingdom. Their frequent Inſurrections againſt K. *James* VI. in laying violent hands on his perſon, at the Caſtle of *Ruthven* in the year 1582, and keeping him Priſoner there, for ſeveral Months together; in raiſing an Army againſt him in the year 1585, in the South parts of the Kingdom, and advancing therewith ſtreight towards *Sterlin* where the King then was; and in tumultuouſly getting to Arms at *Edinburgh*, and there Beſieging the *Seſſion-Houſe*, where the King and his Counſellors were met together; and by that Inſurrection had like to have done conſiderable miſchief, had not their Rage been ſtopt by the Loyalty of ſome Citizens, who inſtantly Aſſembled together

in

in Defence of the King's Person; and the many other Commotions they raised against his Government by their Seditious Libels and Sermons; besides that the whole Reign of King *Charles* the First, that most just and clement Prince, was nothing else but a perpetual Succession of Rebellions raised against him by these Presbyterian Votaries. I say, all these Instances of their Treasonable and Rebellious Practices in former Times are sufficient Grounds to justifie the Nation, in Enacting such Laws as might best prevent these Disturbances for the future, without having any recourse to these After-Monuments of their Rebellion to justifie the Proceedings of the Government against them. However the Reader may easily judge from these Covenants and Declarations, whether any Government or Society can possibly subsist where such pernicious Principles and Practices are tolerated.

But that it was meerly the frequent Rebellions of this Party against the State, which occasioned the Enacting of these Laws against them, does partly appear from this Author's own Concessions. For, *Pag.* 11. he owns, That their Field-meetings, which they had under pretence of Religion, were called by the Parliament, *Rendevouzes of Rebellion*: And *Pag.* 14. he grants, That after the Defeat they received at their Insurrection of *Bothwel-bridge*, the Prisoners were all set at Liberty upon this only Condition, Of giving Bond *never to rise in Arms against the King on any pretence whatsoever*; and yet a great many of them were still so harden'd in their Rebellion, as to refuse their Liberty upon such easie Terms. And yet, methinks, these were no very hard Conditions from such a *persecuting* Government as they are pleased to represent it; but from hence we may easily perceive, that the whole Design of the Government and its Ministers in Enacting these Laws, was only to secure the Peace and Quiet of the Nation, and by all the calm Methods imaginable to reclaim these deluded Creatures from their Seditious and Treasonable Practices against the State. And after *Argile*'s Rebellion in the Year 1685, which threatned nothing less than the utter ruine of the Monarchy, and in which the whole Presbyterian Party were engaged, when *Argile* himself was made Captive, his whole Forces dispersed, and many of them taken Prisoners, and so lying at the Mercy of the Government; yet such was its Clemency towards them, that besides those who were killed in the Skirmishes betwixt the two Armies, I'm confident there were not four in the whole Nation that suffered Death upon that account. So mercifully were they then dealt with, although now they complain of the greatest

That this was the true occasion of Enacting these Penal Laws, appears from our Authors own Concessions.

greatest Oppression! Again, *Pag.* 15. our Author confesses, That a Party of the Presbyterians did declare *King* Charles *the Second to have forfeited his Right to the Crown, and to be no more King, and at the same time, because of his Vicious Life, they Excommunicated him*; which this Author expressly justifies them in, by saying, *They had more Honesty than Policy in doing so.* And whether the Tolerating such kind of Practices as these be not altogether inconsistent with the safety of any Government, I leave my Reader to judge. Can the mildest Government on Earth wink at such open and avowed Designs of subverting the Monarchy? Can it suffer a number of deluded People to range up and down the Country like as many wild Bears, threatning Destruction to the State and all its Ministers, declaring it Lawful to Murder all such as had any Hand in the Government of the Nation, and putting these Threatnings in Execution against some of the Loyal Subjects? Can it be imagined, that any Government should Tolerate such pernicious Courses, and so destructive of its own Security, without endeavouring to bring the Ringleaders and Incendiaries of this Rebellion to condign Punishment? And after this account of the occasion of the Presbyterians Sufferings, I think I may very confidently appeal to any disinteressed Person, whether the Episcopal Party had not very good reason to complain of their present Persecution in *Scotland*, as being more Grievous than any Treatment the Presbyterians ever met with; since what they suffered, (and are pleased to call by the Name of *Persecution,*) was always for their Rebellion and Treasonable Conspiracies against the Government. But what the Episcopal Party do now suffer, or have suffered since this Revolution at the Presbyterians hands, is meerly for Maintaining and Asserting the Principles of our Religion, and Adhering to the Communion of the Catholick Church, without which they can pretend no just Title to the Priviledges of the Gospel.

It has been the constant practice of the Presbyterians to shelter their Treasonable Designs under the name of Religion.

Although there is nothing more clear and evident than that what the Presbyterians suffered under the late Reigns was meerly for their Rebellion; yet this Author has the confidence to perswade us, *Pag.* 13. That *all their Sufferings were upon the account of Religion, and at the Instigation of the Episcopal Clergy.* If the Presbyterians will needs cover their Treasonable Designs against the State always with the Name of *Religion,* and when they are punished for Rebellion, pretend that they suffer for Conscience-sake, who can help it? But it is evident from the Laws enacted against them, and the Punishments inflicted upon some of their Party, that whatever Pretences they

they might make to Religion, yet the State took notice only of their Rebellion. If they, under a pretence of judging it unlawful to hear the Episcopal Ministers preach, shall abstain from Church, and meet together (sometimes all of them in Arms) in their House and Field-Conventicles, the better to carry on their Designs against the State, and there Preach nothing but Treason and Rebellion; and if the Government upon this account shall strictly prohibit all such seditious Meetings, and punish those who frequent them; can this, I beseech you, be called *Suffering for Religion?* And yet this is the very case of our Presbyterians; for their Meetings were Prohibited by Act of Parliament, chiefly upon account of the Sedition and Rebellion vented in them. But this is no new thing in our Presbyterians; it has been not only their constant Practice, but likewise of all other Seditious and Ambitious Persons, in subverting the Government of a Kingdom, in overturning States and Nations always to cover their wicked Designs of Rebellion with the specious pretext of Religion. To amuse and delude the vulgar sort of People, they publish in their Declarations, That they design nothing by their Attempts, but the good and safety of Religion, when in the mean time any thinking or considering Man may clearly perceive, that they have no other Design or Aim before their Eyes, but to promote their own wicked and ambitious Ends. Now to deal with Religion in this dissembling and hypocritical manner, to shelter their villanous Designs under the Patronage of the Just and Holy GOD, is such a contempt of Religion and all that's Sacred, such an Act of Wickedness and Villany, as the Divine Justice cannot easily Pardon.

The Sufferings of the Presbyterians no ways promoted by the Episcopal Clergy.

Upon what Ground our Author alledges, That their Sufferings were *at the Instigation of the Episcopal Clergy*, I cannot readily conjecture. I am sure many Instances may be brought to prove the contrary, where the Clergy have interceeded with the Government in behalf of many of these Rebels who were most obnoxious to Punishment, and by their importunate Intercessions have saved their Lives, thinking by these calm and mild Methods to reclaim them from their Errors and strong Delusions. Indeed the Event proved far otherwise, for in our late Distractions, these Men, who had been so mercifully dealt with, were the most furious and violent in carrying on the Commotions against the State, and the Persecution against the Clergy. Nay, their Ingratitude was such, that they alone occasioned the rabbling of those very Clergy-men, who had formerly been so instrumental in rescuing them from the Gallows. But I would willingly ask our Author here, Whether he can charge any of our

Clergy with Petitioning the Government for the Execution of any of these Rebels, as the custom was in former times when Presbytery had Usurped the Government both of Church and State. Many Instances of this kind might be here produced to shew the Cruelty of the Presbyterian Party, how their *Teachers* during the late Civil Wars did often Petition the Committee of Estates for a speedy Execution of the Prisoners, when they were all of them Men of extraordinary Worth and Integrity, and had no Crime alledged against them but Loyalty to their Prince, as was done by the Commission of the Kirk assembled at *Perth* in the Year 1645; and how they have perswaded the Generals of their Armies to put those Prisoners to the Edge of the Sword, who had surrendred themselves upon Quarters asked and given, as they did after the Defeat of *Montrose* by *David Lesly* at *Philiphaugh* in the same Year 1645. For the Foot in *Montrose*'s Army surrendred themselves upon Quarters, which the General readily granted; but the Presbyterian Ministers, who were then in the Army, were highly enraged that Quarters should be given to such Wretches as they, and declared it to be an act of most sinful Impiety to spare them, and so by their Importunity they prevailed with *D. Lesly* to suffer the Army to be let loose upon them, and cut them all in pieces. Many such Instances of their Cruelty might be here produced from the History of these Times, but I purposely forbear to mention any more of them.

Vid. *Spirit of Calumny.*

The Ministers of State under King Charles's *Government, sufficiently vindicated from our Author's Aspersions of Cruelty.*

This, I think, is all that is needful to be said here in Answer to our Author's First Part, since Sir *George Mackenzie* in the above-named Treatise has already demonstrated to the satisfaction of all disinterested Persons, that what the Presbyterians suffered under the former Reigns was occasioned meerly by their own Rebellion, and could not in any justice be imputed to the severity of the Government. And the same Reasons that justifie the Government in Enacting these Laws against the Presbyterians, will likewise Vindicate those Noble Persons who were employed either in the State or Army under that Government, from the Aspersions of Cruelty thrown upon them by this *Scribler*. If the Government be endangered by the Tumults and Insurrections of a Party, must the Ministers thereof overlook such dangerous Practices, and not put the Laws in execution against the Incendiaries of these Commotions? Though I am certain it was done with the greatest Tenderness and Lenity imaginable by those Gentlemen whom this Author in his Pamphlet accuses of the greatest Cruelty. Most of the Persons concerned in the Administration of Affairs under that Government, especially those

those whom he chiefly vents his Malice against, *Pag.* 26. are known to be Men of such Worth and Merit, that our Author does his Party no small prejudice, by letting the World know, that their Practices have been such, as to provoke Men of that Honour and Quality to be their Enemies.

A short Narrative of the Proceedings of the Council against some Ministers turned out in 1662.

But before I put an end to this Chapter, I must consider one Particular more which this Author urges as an Instance of the severity of that Government, and where the Parties that did Suffer cannot be so properly said to have suffered for Rebellion, though they may justly enough be charged with an obstinate and peevish Contempt of the lawful Commands of their Superiors. It is *Pag.* 6. where he says, That *by the Instigation of the Prelates, the Council by their Act,* Octob. 1662. *turned out* 300 *Ministers out of their Churches, without either Accusation, Citation, Conviction or Sentence, or a Hearing allowed them.* To answer this Objection, there needs no more but a true Narrative of the Matter of Fact, which I shall here set down as briefly as I can, and then leave it to the Judgment of my Reader, whether this Matter, when truly represented, can be with any reason urged as an Instance of the Severity of that Government. In the Year 1649. when there was no King in our *Israel*, and the Presbyterians at liberty to act as they listed, the Right of Patronages was abolished by Act of Parliament; and after the Restoration of the Royal Family, there was an Act of Parliament in the Year 1662, restoring this Right to the Patrons, and requiring all the Clergy to take Presentations from them, under the pain of forfeiting their Churches. But that the present Incumbents, who had entered to their Churches without a Presentation from the Patron, might not sustain any Damage by this Act, it was thereby provided, That the Patrons should give Presentations to none but to those Persons who were in actual possession of the Churches, and had entred thereto by the *Call of the People.* There were several Presbyterian Ministers who refused to give any Compliance with this Act of Parliament, and would take no Presentation from the Patron; and therefore the Privy-Council issued out a Proclamation, requiring all the Clergy comply with this Act of Parliament, and declaring the Places of those void who refused to yield Obedience thereto. Upon which the Non-Compliers of their own accord (so that there was no need either of *Accusation* or *Sentence* against them) abstained, after the Time limited by the Act, from the Exercise of their Ministry, and the Patrons took care to present others to the vacant Churches. But I cannot see the least shadow of reason, why this Act should be urged as

Vid. *Establishment.*

an Inſtance of ſo great ſeverity in the Government, ſince there was not the leaſt harm thereby intended to the Clergy; the deſign of the Act was only to ſecure the Rights of particular Perſons which had been incroached upon in the Presbyterian Uſurpations; for the Miniſters that had been in poſſeſſion of their Churches before the Year 1649, and had received Preſentations from the right Patrons, were not included in this Act, but remained in their Settlements as before; and ſuch as were now willing to own the Right of their Patrons, by taking Preſentations from them, were allowed to keep their Churches, and the Patrons obliged to give Preſentations to them, and to none elſe if they were willing to accept of them. So that whatever may be objected againſt the Uncanonicalneſs of the Proceedings againſt them, (though even that may be juſtified, ſince all the Biſhops concurred with what was done by the Council in that matter,) that their Sentence of Deprivation ought to have been pronounced by a Spiritual rather than a Lay-Court, and that the Biſhops were more competent Judges to deprive them of the Exerciſe of their Miniſtry than the Privy-Council; yet I am ſure there is not the leaſt ground to urge it as an act of Severity in the Government, ſince theſe Miniſters were permitted to keep their Churches upon ſuch eaſie Terms, and the mildneſs of the Government towards them was ſuch, that many of them, notwithſtanding they abſolutely refuſed to comply with this Act of Parliament, or own the Authority of their Biſhops, were indulged by the favour of the Biſhops to keep peaceable Poſſeſſion of their Churches, although this Author maliciouſly inſinuates, that all their Sufferings were occaſioned *by the Inſtigation of the Prelates.* But a fuller Account of this you have in a late Diſcourſe, Entituled, *An Account of the late Eſtabliſhment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of* Scotland, *Anno* 1690. *Pag.* 14.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

OUR Author in his Second Part confines himſelf to a particular Confutation of the Treatiſe, Entituled, *The Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*; but before he begins to take it to task, he's very high in his Panegyricks upon the Lords, *Crawford* and *Melvil*. I don't incline to make any particular Reflexions either upon the Parts or Integrity of theſe two Lords, the Tree may be eaſily known by its Fruits; but this I muſt beg our Author's leave to ſay, That as for their ſhare in this barbarous Perſecution of our Clergy, let them uſe all the means imaginable to conceal it from the Eyes of Strangers, let them deny it never ſo impudently, yet their own Conſciences, and the ſtarving Orphans of many of our poor Clergy, will appear as dreadful Witneſſes againſt them, in that Great and Terrible Day, when they are called to give an Account of all their Actions, whether good or bad. And all the harm I wiſh them is, that they may at laſt ſeriouſly reflect upon the great Injuſtice and Barbarity of their Proceedings towards our Clergy, that ſo by their unfeigned Repentance they may Atone for theſe Crimes, and ſave their Souls in the Day of the Lord.

The Presbyterians have juſtified the Murder of the Archbiſhop of S. Andrews in the face of Authority upon ſeveral occaſions.

In the next place, he accuſes the Author of the *Presbyterian Eloquence*, for aſſerting a great many Untruths in his Book; and, *p.* 36. he inſtances in that, of charging the Presbyterians with the Murder of the A. Bp. of St. *Andrews*; For (ſays he) *the Presbyterians were ſo far from approving it, that they refuſed the Sacrament to thoſe concerned in it, particularly at the Scots Congregation in Rotterdam.* What Abhorrence the Presbyterians in *Holland* had of this barbarous Murder, I cannot well ſay; but this I'm ſure of, that our Presbyterians in *Scotland* were ſo far from deteſting it, that they generally approved of it as a moſt Noble and Glorious Action; and I dare boldly affirm, that never one of the Party there refuſed to admit the Murderers to their Sacraments, or ever offered to inflict any other Cenſure upon them for this heinous Villany. On the contrary, it is notorious how moſt of the Presbyterians that ſuffered for their Rebellion in *Scotland* did juſtifie this Murder in the face of Authority, and commended it as an act of good Service done to God and his Church in delivering them from ſuch an *Oppreſſor*. This our Author's impudence can hardly

hardly ſerve him to deny boldly enough, and therefore he's ſatisfied rather to recriminate the Matter upon the Epiſcopal Party, by charging the Privy-Council of *Scotland* with *Hanging five Men in* Magus-Moor *as the Archbiſhop's Murderers, though never one of them had ſeen a Biſhop.* Theſe Men were puniſhed by a lawful Authority, and conform to the Laws of the Land; for though they were not the Murderers of the Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, yet they were notoriouſly guilty of Treaſon and Rebellion againſt the Government; and theſe Crimes being ſufficiently proved againſt them, and they juſtifying and approving of the Archbiſhop's murder, I think it was no breach, either of the Laws of God or Man, to make them a publick Example for the terrifying other wicked Offenders, and ſecuring the Peace of the Society for the future.

Page 37. Mitchel's Execution juſtified.

He ſays likewiſe, *That the Council hanged Mr.* Mitchel *for ſhooting at the ſaid Archbiſhop, though he miſſed him.* But although this Villain happened to miſs of his Deſign againſt the Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, yet the Biſhop of *Orkney* being then in Coach with the Archbiſhop, was unfortunately wounded with the ſame Shot, which occaſioned his Death, tho not very ſhortly after. Now I can hardly think, that any good Man would ever offer to condemn the puniſhing of ſuch a Villany; and really I very much wonder, that this Author regards ſo little the Credit and Reputation of his own Party, as to offer ſo publickly to countenance or excuſe ſuch Villainous Practices, as have juſtly rendred that Party odious to the whole World. What he alledges about the Earl of *Rothes* and the Council their promiſing *Mitchel* his Life upon Confeſſion, is nothing but a meer Fiction: For I am credibly informed, that they ſolemnly declared before the Juſtice Court, That they never made him any ſuch Promiſe; and certainly if they had, they were all of them Men of more Honour and Integrity than to have retracted it.

Page 39. The making the Inclinations of the People the Standard of Church Government, is of very fatal conſequences to the Intereſt of Religion.

This Author is at a great deal of pains to prove, that *Presbytery* is more popular in *Scotland* than *Epiſcopacy*, which has ever been much inſiſted upon by the Presbyterians as a great Argument for the Lawfulneſs of their Government, as if any Principle or Doctrine were the Truer, becauſe agreeable to the *Inclinations of the People.* If this be the Standard of Truth, why was not Chriſtianity exploded, and Heatheniſm ſtill continued, as being more ſuitable to the Humours of the People? This is ſuch a Foundation for the Truths of our Religion, as will go near to ſubvert all its Doctrines; ſince many of them are ſo far from being popular, that they are downright Enemies to Fleſh and Blood, and oblige us to abſtain from all thoſe Worldly

Worldly Pleasures which we so greedily pursue. 'Tis but a bad sign of the weakness of a Cause, when they flee for shelter to the fickle and unconstant Humours of the Vulgar; when they betake themselves to such weak and frivolous Arguments in defence of their Government, 'tis a shrewd indication they are at a loss for better to produce. This new Method we have taken up to promote Religion, by establishing nothing that is contrary to the Inclinations of a People, may chance to have more fatal Consequences than we at present seem to be aware of. The settling the Government of the Church upon such a slippery Foundation, dispose People to look upon it as a thing altogether indifferent and ambulatory, so that each Nation may set up what form of Church-Government they please. But if we consider a little the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Religion, we'll soon find that the Government of the Church is not of such an ambulatory Nature, and that it is a very essential part of the Constitution, yea so essential, that it is not in the power of Man to alter it. For God having established his Church as a Society, and invested it with peculiar Priviledges belonging thereto; he must be allowed to have settled and established a distinct Order of Persons for the governing it, and for admitting Members to a right to all those Priviledges which he has appropriated to the Members of the Society. And if he has separated a certain Order of Persons for this Office, and impowered them, and them alone, to seal his Covenants in his Name, it must needs be Sacriledge in the highest degree for any to usurp that Office, without a due and legal Call from those whom God has appointed to conveigh his Authority. And God can never be obliged by the acts of those Persons whom he never authorized to represent him, no more than a King can be said to be under any obligation to ratifie the acts of any one that usurps his Authority, and falsly pretends to be his Ambassador. So that to alter the Government of the Church from what it was at first constituted by our Saviour, is nothing less than to undermine the whole ground of our Salvation, since we can have no Title to the Benefits of the Gospel, but as we are Members of Christ's Church here on Earth; and we cannot pretend to be Members, unless we be admitted into the Society by those Persons whom God has delegated to that Office, and intrusted with that Power. But notwithstanding the impertinence and weakness of this Argument in Vindication of the Church-Government, yet since our Author insults so mightily upon it, I shall comply with him so far as to consider the grounds of his Assertion; only I would caution the Reader never to lay stress on such

such kind of Arguments, as are altogether incompetent, and of no force to prove the Truth of any Principle of Religion. For there is no Doctrine which is in it self false, that can be justified by never so general a reception of it; and therefore, it can be no Argument of the lawfulness of any form of Church Government, that it is the most agreeable to the *Inclinations of the People.*

The Presbyterians having made more Insurrections in the Kingdom, in behalf of their Church Government, than the Episcopal Church have thought fit to do, is no Argument that Presbytery is more popular in Scotland, *than Episcopacy.*

All his Evidences to prove, that Presbytery is more popular in *Scotland* than Episcopacy, amount to no more than this, that the Presbyterians have made more Insurrections in behalf of their Government, than the Episcopal Church ever thought fit to do. And that this is not sufficient evidence enough to prove their point, will easily appear from hence. The Principles of our Presbyterians with respect to Monarchy, are of a very large extent; they make the Supreme Power of the Nation accountable to his Subjects, and allow he may be resisted and Dethroned for his Male-Administration. So that, if the Sovereign shall at any time think fit to make such Alterations, either in Church or State, as do not exactly quadrate with the Wild Humours and Fancies of that Party; then they instantly betake themselves to Arms, and resolve to involve the Nation into Blood and Confusion, rather than fail of having their unaccountable Humours gratified. But the Episcopal Church of that Kingdom have greater restraints upon them; they own, in Conformity to the Laws of the Realm, and to the Laws of God in his first Institution of Government; that the Supreme Power is irresistable, and cannot for any Male-Administration be Dethroned by his Subjects; that if he be guilty of any Illegal or Unjustifiable Actions in his Government, he is accountable to none for them, but to God alone. And therefore, although the Sovereign should chance to Establish such Constitutions, either in Church or State, as are contrary both to the Laws of God, and the particular Laws of the Realm; yet by reason of their strict Obligations to absolute submission, they are not at Liberty to Rise in Arms, and assert their Rights that are thus encroached upon. They may indeed very lawfully refuse their actual concurrence and compliance with these sinful Constitutions; but to resist or Dethrone their Sovereign upon that Account, is what they are not able to Justifie, either by the Laws of God, or the Laws of the Nation. This is, and has been the constant Principle and Doctrine of our Church; and if any of its Members have Acted contrary thereto, they have in so far deserted the Principles of their Church, and slighted their Sacred Vows and Obligations, and therefore ought in Conscience speedily to return

to

to their Duty. The Reaſon why the Epiſcopal Church Act more ſubmiſſively to the Lawful Powers than the Presbyterians, is not, that there lie ſtricter Obligations to Obedience upon the one Party than the other; no, they are both ſubject to the ſame Laws, are obliged to own the ſame Prince; and are under the ſame Obligations and Ties of Conſcience to ſubmit and adhere to him. But the difference lies here, that the Epiſcopal Church make ſome Conſcience of performing their Duty, and of Walking anſwerably to their Vows and Obligations; and reſolve, in Conformity to their Primitive Anceſtors; rather to ſuffer Perſecution than be guilty of Rebellion. On the contrary, the Presbyterians ſacrifice all Duties to the Intereſt of their Party; and where that is concerned, make light of all Obligations: So that, whoever conſiders the different Principles of both theſe Parties, will never conclude from hence, that Presbytery is more popular in *Scotland* than Epiſcopacy, meerly, becauſe there have been more popular Inſurrections for it, than for the other; ſince the Presbyterians think it lawful to Rebel upon that account, and the Epiſcopal Church look upon it as altogether unjuſtifiable to reſiſt the lawful Powers upon any account, even of Religion it ſelf.

This laſt Convention having abolished Epiſcopacy, and eſtabliſhed Presbytery, is no good Argument, that the Presbyterians have the majority of the Nation on their ſide.

As for what our Author urges concerning the great Party that appeared for the Presbyterian Government in this laſt Convention, which Aboliſhed Epiſcopacy, and Eſtabliſhed Presbytery; I ſhall plainly make it appear, that this can be no Argument, that they have the Majority of the Nation on their ſide. At the time when this Convention was called in *Scotland*, the Affairs of our Nation were in ſuch a diſtracted condition, as made the Event altogether uncertain; and upon this account many of the Epiſcopal Gentlemen who were wont formerly to be Members of Parliament, thought it ſafer to keep out of publick buſineſs, and therefore refuſed to be Elected by thoſe Shires and Burroughs whom they uſed always to repreſent in Parliament. Nay, ſome of them were ſo averſe from being Elected themſelves, that they would not ſo much as be preſent to Vote at the Election of others, thinking it to be a direct breach of their Ties and Oaths to the Government, and particularly that of the *Teſt*, to meet or conſult about the Affairs of the Nation without the conſent of the King. So that at many of the Elections one third part of the Members concerned therein refuſed to be preſent, and the Epiſcopal Gentlemen declining to be Elected, there was no oppoſition made to any that would ſtand; and this was certainly the Reaſon why more Presbyterian Members

crept into this Convention, than ever durſt appear in the like Aſſembly before. But notwithſtanding this great advantage the Presbyterians had in theſe Elections; yet even in the Convention, had not the Epiſcopal party been divided among themſelves about the Civil Government, their Adverſaries could never have gained any ground upon them, in altering the State of our Church. For many of the Epiſcopal Nobility and Gentry being diſſatisfied about the lawfulneſs of the State Revolution, withdrew from the Convention of Eſtates before the Affairs of the Church were conſidered; and this you muſt needs ſuppoſe, was no ſmall diminution of the intereſt of the Epiſcopal Church in that Convention, and enabled the Presbyterians to do there as they pleaſed. And ſo I think this ſhort Account of the State of our Nation at that time is ſufficient to convince the Reader; that although Presbytery was Eſtabliſhed by that Convention; yet it by no means follows, that the Majority of our Nation inclines to that Government. 'Tis known to any who are the leaſt converſant in the Affairs of our Country, that the perſons who are moſtly drawn away with the ſtrong deluſions of that party, are but of the meaner and vulgar ſort, and thoſe only in the Weſtern parts of the Kingdom; but the greateſt part of our Nobility and Gentry, are Men of more Judgment and Reaſon, of a freer and more Noble Education, than to be ſo infatuated, or deluded by vain and imaginary Dreams. And therefore to clear them from this imputation of Meanneſs thrown upon them by this Author, and in his own Phraſe, *to cut the Throat of this Objection* once for all, that we may not be hereafter any more ſtunn'd with the Noiſe hereof; I could have ſubjoyned hereunto a LIST of all our Nobility that are not Popiſh, and have Ranked them according as they are affected, either to the Epiſcopal, or Presbyterian Government; but being at ſuch a diſtance, cannot have it exact. And if it were not a thing of unſufferable Toil, and of little or no moment, to make an exact Liſt of the Gentry of the Nation, I could ſhew a far greater Diſparity among them, with Reſpect to this Affair, than could even here appear in the Liſt of the Nobility, and yet it might be evident from it, how vaſtly conſiderable the Epiſcopal Intereſt is among them, beyond that of the Presbyterian.

Pag. 42. Another of the untruths with which this Author charges his Adverſary, is, for aſſerting, That *the Epiſcopal Rulers and Miniſters uſed all Chriſtian and diſcreet Methods to gain Diſſenters.* And why our Author ſhould have ſo much Malice as to deny this known Truth,

I cannot well imagine, for 'tis certain, that the behaviour of the Episcopal Clergy towards the Presbyterian Dissenters, was truly Christian and Brotherly; they used all fair and discreet Methods to reclaim them from their Errors and Delusions, and their endeavours that way were, by the blessing of God so successful, that at the time when K. *James* Granted his Indulgence to his Subjects, there were scarcely any Presbyterians in the whole Nation (except a few Wild *Cameronians*, who betook themselves to the Hills) that did not actually joyn in Communion with the Episcopal Church; their very Teachers came punctually to Church, and attended upon the Ministry of the Episcopal Clergy; they were constant Hearers of their Sermons, and frequently Received the Sacraments from their Hands. Now I would gladly know of our Adversaries, what plausible Reason they can give for deserting our Communion, after the Promulgation of this Indulgence, when they thought it lawful to joyn with us before. What excuse can they pretend for so groundless a Separation, to separate from a Communion, which they themselves owned to be lawful, by their joyning therein? Our Constitution still remained the same; there was no Alteration in it, that could afford them the least pretext for leaving our Communion; and Episcopacy can never be urged in their Defence, since by their former practice, they declared it lawful to Communicate with Bishops. Methinks, that if they had any true Notions of Schism, they might soon perceive how clearly the charge of it lies against them upon this score, and it concerns them highly to Vindicate themselves in this point, and to shew that, by separating from a lawful Established Communion, which they themselves by joyning with it, owned to be lawful, and in which there were no sinful Terms required, they were no ways guilty of Schism.

The Methods used by the Episcopal Clergy for reclaiming the Dissenters shewn to be very effectual since at the time of K. J's Indulgence there were few or no Presbyterians but what joyned in Communion with the Episcopal Church.

Pag. 43. He accuses his Adversary of downright Lying, because he asserts, *That the Presbyterians have justled out, and Vilify'd the Lord's Prayer, and Abolished the Reading of the Scriptures in Churches*; and yet with the same Breath, he confesses the Assertion to be true, and endeavours to Vindicate their practice therein. He alledges the frequent Use of the Lord's Prayer, is a meer prophaning of it, and upon this Account, he thinks the Presbyterians may totally abstain from the use thereof; which is such an instance of Veneration to Sacred things, as is not often to be met with; that because a Sacred thing may sometimes chance to be abused to Superstition, therefore we must altogether slight and contemn it. May not we upon the same ground likewise abstain from Worshipping God,

The Presbyterian practice in Vilifying our Saviours Prayer altogether inexcusable.

ſince the Divine Worſhip has been prophan'd by the Heatheniſh Superſtitions, in paying that Adoration to inanimate Creatures, which is due only to the Eternal and Infinite Being? But the Presbyterian practice in this contempt of our Saviours Prayer, is ſo very ridiculous, and many of their party have uttered ſuch Blaſphemous Expreſſions concerning it, that they deſerve no ſmall Rebuke. And I don't ſee how they can well Vindicate themſelves from what is charged upon them by the Author of the *Presbyterian Eloquence*, that when a Presbyterian Miniſter was Staged before one of their own Judicatories for this Blaſphemous Expreſſion, *That if ever our Saviour was Drunk, it was when he compoſed his Prayer*, they would not ſo much as enquire into the Truth of this Accuſation, notwithſtanding it was brought before them, by a perſon of known Honour and Integrity, who had been one of the Judges of the Nation, and offered to prove the Truth of his Accuſation, by the Teſtimony of ſuch Witneſſes as could not be well rejected. Now methinks, that although their concern for puniſhing ſuch Blaſphemous Expreſſions had not influenced them, yet at leaſt the deference they owed to a Man of his Character and Quality, ought to have engaged them to take this matter into their cognizance, and make ſome enquiry into it; and what excuſe they can pretend for this Neglect I cannot apprehend, the matter of Fact being ſo Notorious, that there was no denying it? Their *Aboliſhing the Reading of the Scriptures in Churches* is likewiſe ſo generally known, that our Author does not offer to deny it. It is cuſtomary in the Church of *Scotland*, that always at the beginning of Divine Service, the Clerk is appointed to Read two or three Chapters, in the Old or New Teſtament, for the Inſtruction of thoſe who come ſooner to Church than others; that their thoughts being taken up with hearing the Holy Scriptures Read, they may have no occaſion to ſpend that time in gazing about them in the Church, or entertaining one another with trivial Diſcourſes; and this the Clerk continues to do, till the uſual time that the Congregation be fully met. This practice the Presbyterians have quite Aboliſhed, and inſtead of the Scriptures, have ſet up their more Sacred Oracles, the confuſed Farce of ſome of their Sermons, which they Order to be Read, for the Edification of their Auditors, till the uſual time that their Sermon begins.

**The Malicious Character this Author gives of the Engliſh and Scots Gentry as well as Clergy.*

*Our Author *Pag.* 47. Quarrels his Adverſary, for ſaying, That the Author of the *Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of* Scotland; beſtows the Characters of Godleſs Miſcreants, infamous

infamous Parricides, Sorcerers, and inceſtuous Apoſtates upon the Scots Gentry, as well as Clergy. And although he will not allow the truth of this in that Author whom he endeavours to vindicate, yet he himſelf is ſo very civil as to Treat them at the ſame ſcurrilous rate in many places of his Book. As for the Clergy, he ſpares none of their Rank or Order, but repreſents them all as the worſt of Men, and belches out his Vomit againſt them in ſuch obſcene and ſcurrilous Language, as any modeſt Man would have been aſhamed to utter. The Epiſcopal Gentry both of *England* and *Scotland* he repreſents as Robbers and Murderers; as generally Pro- *Page* 23.
phane and Debauched; as Men void of all manner of Religion, *Page* 38.
who, in ſtead of frequenting the Religious Aſſemblies, do haunt Bawdy-houſes, and are drunk in Taverns and Ale-houſes. But it is *Page* 13.
no wonder he ſhould Treat our Clergy and Gentry at this rate, when he has not the leaſt reſpect to the Sacred Perſons of our Princes; them he repreſents as wallowing in their Sins and Uncleanneſs, and avowing their Adulteries as *Sodom*. And what Treatment the Author of ſuch Villanous Reflexions does deſerve, I leave the Reader to judge. To Treat the Sacred Perſons of Princes and Prelates, the Anointed of the Lord, in ſuch a ſcurrilous manner, to wound the Reputation of Men of known Honour and Integrity at this rate, is ſuch a piece of Villany as can hardly receive a ſufficient Puniſhment. Can any Man that is not totally void of Religion write in this Inhumane and Unchriſtian manner? To repreſent all that differ in Principles from them as worſe than Infidels; this is ſuch an act of Malice as I believe was never practiced among Heathens or Barbarians, and it is no ſmall Scandal to our Religion, that any who call themſelves by the name of Chriſt ſhould be guilty of ſuch barbarous Practices.

This Scribler endeavours, *Pag.* 52. to anſwer an Objection which his Adverſary brings againſt their new and unheard-of Practice, of ſettling and abrogating Matters of Religion, even thoſe that are moſt eſſential, according as they are either agreeable or contrary to the inconſtant Humours of the Vulgar. His Argument runs thus; That upon the ſame Grounds our Presbyterians in *Scotland* declared Epiſcopacy to be *Anti-humane*, Chriſtianity muſt be Anti-humane in *Turky*, and Proteſtantiſm in *France* and *Spain*; and therefore ought in all Equity to be rejected by them, they being contrary to this new Standard, the *Inclinations of the People*. This Argument *a Pari* is ſo very concluſive, and preſſeth our Author ſo hard, that in ſtead of Confuting, he is forced to yield to it; and he very fairly grants, that

The ſettling or abrogating Matters of Religion in compliance with the Humours of the Populace, ſtands directly in oppoſition to the propagating of the Chriſtian Religion.

that if Chriſtianity or Proteſtantiſm be contrary to the Inclinations of the People in theſe Parts, they may reject it as Anti-humane, and it ought no ways to be impoſed upon them. I wiſh this Author would but conſider a little, whither this Principle of his carries him, what abſurd and pernicious Conſequences he is forced to grant, and what great diſſervice he does to the Intereſt of Religion meerly through a blind and miſtaken Zeal for his own Cauſe. It ſeems ſtrange to ſee Men ſo hurried away with the Spirit of Contradiction, as not to diſcern ſuch plain and obvious Conſequences. Is it poſſible at this rate ever to make any Converts to the Chriſtian or Reformed Religion, except where it already generally prevails? And how the Chriſtian Religion could at firſt be propagated through the World according to this new Principle, is a thing impoſſible to conceive. I would gladly know of this Author, what Arguments he can poſſibly bring to convert theſe Heathen Nations to the Chriſtian, or to perſwade the Popiſh Countries to embrace the Reformed Religion? They can eaſily retort upon him his own Argument, That the Chriſtian Religion being contrary to the Inclinations of the People in theſe Parts, they ought to declare it to be *Anti-humane*, and no ways to receive it, and how our Author can well evade the force of this Argument I do not apprehend. If the *Inclinations of the People* muſt needs be the Standard of Truth, I'm ſure we can have no hopes of their Converſion, ſince they are by this Principle obliged to perſiſt in their Idolatries and Corruptions, and the Popiſh Countries muſt ſtill adhere to their Errors and Superſtitions. If any of them deſert their Errors, and embrace the true Religion, then, according to our Author's Hypotheſis, they embrace what is Anti-humane, and what they ought to reject as being contrary to the Inclinations of the People. The only thing our Author comforts himſelf with in this matter, is, that he's confident the People of theſe Countries can never declare the Chriſtian or Proteſtant Religion to be contrary to their Inclinations. But upon what Evidence he grounds his Confidence, I cannot eaſily imagine. Does he fancy, that the generality of the People in *Turky*, and theſe other barbarous Nations, are more inclinable to the Chriſtian Religion than to their own Idolatrous Corruptions? Do they not declare againſt our Religion as a downright Cheat and Impoſture? And do not thoſe of the Romiſh Communion look upon our Reformation as a meer Innovation? And what Encouragement this Author affords theſe Enemies of our Religion to continue in their Errors and Superſtitions, I leave any ſerious Reader to conſider; he has taught them a new Principle,

by

by which they may easily evade the force of all the Arguments we can bring for their Conversion.

I find our Author here takes notice of one of his Adversaries Observations, where he says, That *the new Gospellers call the Common-Prayer Book Popery*; and this he is so far from denying, that he endeavours to justifie the Charge. Now to see Men pretend to the Spirit of Moderation towards Adversaries, and yet in the mean time be guilty of such an Overt Act of Malice and Disingenuity is not a little amazing. I dare appeal to this Author's own Conscience, that he knows a sensible and a vast difference betwixt the *English* Liturgy and the *Romish* Mass-Book, and yet he's so disingenuous as to perswade the silly and ignorant People, that they are both the same. I'm confident he knows our Liturgy contains no Prayers either to Saint or Angel, and that all our Prayers are directed to the true and sole Object of Divine Worship, the Infinite and Eternal God. We have no Prayers of Intercession or Mediation but which are addressed to the Lamb of God, who sits at the right hand of the Father to make Intercession for us; all our Forms of Prayer are composed of such emphatical and comprehensive Sentences, are framed with such a tendency to raise and elevate the Devotions of the People, that it is beyond the Art of Man to better them. But this has been the constant practice of the Presbyterian Party, to represent every thing as *Popery* that is not in all Points agreeable to their Enthusiastical Dreams; they endeavour to infuse into the Minds of the People dismal and frightning Notions of Popery, and then the better to expose their Adversaries that differ from them to the rage and fury of the Rabble, they brand them with the odious Name of *Papists*; which is such a piece of Malice and Disingenuity as I believe is peculiar to the Party.

The disingenuity of this Author and his Party in calling the English Common-Prayer Book Popery.

In the same Page we have a Vindication of the Presbyterians for not observing the Anniversary of King *Charles* I. his Murder. And the reason of their so doing, our Author says, proceeds from a Principle, that no Humane Power can oblige them to violate the Fourth Commandment, which says positively, *Six days shalt thou work.* This is indeed a new Comment upon the Fourth Commandment, and such as few of our Expositors have been so happy as to light upon. GOD out of his Eternal Wisdom thought fit indeed to separate a seventh part of our Time for his own Worship and Service, and to establish the Sabbatical Festivity in Commemoration of that Great and Omnipotent Work of the Creation, when he rested from framing the Glorious Fabrick of this Universe; and out of his great Bounty to-

The lawfulness of observing Anniversary-days of Humane Institution asserted.

towards the Work of his own Hands, he allowed us the other Six days of the Week for carrying on our Worldly and Temporal Concerns. But was it ever before dreamed, that this Indulgence of Time for our private Labours was such a strict and positive Precept, requiring us to spend these Six days so entirely in working, as if we were not at liberty to set apart any portion thereof to worship God either for publick or private Mercies upon any occasion vouchsafed unto us. We ought not indeed to spend this Time in idleness and vanity, and when we are not taken up about the Service of God, we ought to be diligent in following our private Labours and Callings. But if we employ any portion of this Time either in publick or private Exercises of Devotion, in glorifying God for some Personal or National Blessings conferred upon us, or in deprecating his Wrath for our crying Sins and Abominations; this is so far from being a breach of God's Commands, that it is what he repuires and expects at our hands, and has been the constant practice almost of all Nations in the World. Do we not find that the Jews, besides the Festivals appointed them by their Lawgiver, observed a great many uncommanded Feasts and Fasts, which they themselves had instituted as Anniversary Commemorations of some signal Deliverances? The Feast of *Purim* was instituted by *Mordecai* in remembrance of the delivery of the Jews from *Haman*, who maliciously sought the Destruction of them. And the Feast of *Dedication* was instituted in remembrance of that great Mercy which God shewed unto his People, in delivering them from the Tyranny of *Antiochus*, and the Idolatry which he had forced upon them, setting up the Idol of *Jupiter* in the Temple of God, and abolishing the true Worship of God. It was appointed by *Judas Maccabæus* as a Yearly Festival, to be observed from Year to Year for the space of eight days. Besides these, they had several other Feasts of Humane Institution, of which we find frequent mention in Scripture. We see likewise, that the *Romans* had their *Feriæ*, and their *Festi Dies*; the *Feriæ*, which were instituted to the Honour of their Gods, they observed so Sacredly, that it was a heinous Crime to do any manner of Work on them; on these Days it was unlawful for them *Terram ferro tangere*, as *Servius* tells us. These *Feriæ* were either *Stativæ*, unmoveable Feasts, and appointed always to be kept on a certain Day; or *Imperativæ*, which were Arbitrary, and solemnized upon such Days and on such Occasions as the Magistrates and Priests thought most expedient. And the Practice of the Christian Church in this matter is so notorious, that, besides their frequent occasional Festivities, the greatest

Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, *Pag.* 138.

Esther, *c.* 9.

Serv. *in* Virg. *p.* 86. Macrob. Saturn. *l.* 1. *c.* 16.

greateſt Myſteries of our Religion have been Celebrated in theſe Anniverſary Solemnities through all the Ages of the Church; which is a moſt effectual way to prevent theſe Articles of our Faith from being ſubverted by Hereticks. And thus we ſee, that this practice of obſerving Anniverſary Days has been conſtantly received not only in the Chriſtian and Jewiſh Churches, but likewiſe among the Heathens; it being as it were a Principle engrafted in Humane Nature, to return a ſuitable Tribute of Praiſe and Thanks to the Supream Governour of the World, for diſpoſing and ordering the Events thereof in ſuch a manner as tends moſt to his own Glory, and the Welfare of his peculiar People. So unhappy are our Presbyterians in their Schiſm from the Catholick Church, that in many Doctrines and Cuſtoms wherein they differ from us, they run in a direct oppoſition to the Practice and Judgment, not only of the Catholick Church, but likewiſe of all Mankind; ſo fond are they of their own ſingular Opinions.

What this Author urges in contradiction to this Univerſal Practice of obſerving Anniverſary Days, is of no conſequence; for although there may be *none of the Six on which ſome remarkable Providence hath not happened, as he alledges*; yet it does by no means follow, *that we ſhould have no time left at all for Work*. 'Tis not to be ſuppoſed, that God requires ſuch conſtant Exerciſes of Devotion from us, as to impede the neceſſary Works of Humane Life; 'tis true indeed, there is no Diſpenſation of the Divine Providence, but what is accompanied with ſuch Wiſdom and Prudence as deſerves to be admired and adored by all Rational Creatures, but yet there are ſome Acts thereof ſo ſignal and ſo remarkable in their Events, that they require a more ſolemn acknowledgment at our hands, and deſerve to be more frequently Commemorated by us. And the appointing of ſet Times for Commemorating theſe more ſignal Diſpenſations of Divine Providence muſt be left to the prudence and diſcretion of the Governors of the Church, who are the moſt proper Judges of what concerns the publick Worſhip; and we are not to ſuppoſe them ſo indiſcreet in the conduct of Affairs, as to ſeparate ſuch an unequal ſhare of our Time for the publick Worſhip, as would render Devotion burthenſom to the People, and altogether inconſiſtent with the Neceſſities of Humane Life. And if any private Perſon can, by entailing his Charity upon us, engage us to obſerve an Anniverſary Day for the commemorating of his Charity, as this Author grants he may, I ſee no reaſon why our Superiors either in Church or State may not with far greater Authority oblige us Yearly to Commemorate ſome ſignal

dispensations of the Divine Providence, that have been designed by God, either as a punishment or a Blessing to us.

The Murder of K. Ch. I. justly chargeable upon the Presbyterians in both Kingdoms, and not upon the Nation in general.

But our Author being somewhat jealous, lest this neglect of the Presbyterians to observe the Anniversary of K. *Charles* I. his Murder, should prompt the World to believe, that they approve and justifie the same; he therefore endeavours to perswade us, that *neither the* Scots *nor* English *Presbyterians had any hand in bringing him to his Death.* But their Rebellious and Inhumane practices towards that most clement Prince, are too Notorious for the Party now to think to conceal them; how many Insurrections they Raised, both against him and his Father is but too well known; and when they forced him to Grant Concessions, which were no small encroachments upon his Prerogative and Honour, yet nothing would satisfie their capricious Humours, but the overturning both of Church and State. If we but look back a little into the History of these Tragical times, we shall find, that the Presbyterians in both Nations were the chief Instruments of obstructing the peaceable and quiet Reign of that Religious Monarch, and of bringing at last, that fatal stroak upon him. Was it not they, who sowed the first Seeds of all these Wars and Confusions, and having Treasonably associated themselves together, Rose in Arms against his Majesty, under a Wicked pretence of Reformation? And having reduced him to such Extremities, that he was forced to throw himself at their Mercy; how basely did they Treat him? For when the King escaping from the Siege of *Oxford*, committed himself to their Army at *Newark*; the first thing they forced him to do, was to command his Governour of *Newark* to deliver up the City, and *Montrose*, *Huntly* and *Mackdonald*, and all others that were in Arms for him in *Scotland*, to disband. Had not the King been advised to these Courses, he might have happily prevented all these fatal consequences that followed thereupon; but His Majesty was now reduced to such circumstances, that it behoved him to Grant whatever they pleased to demand. And afterwards, in the Parliament of *Scotland*, which met at *Edinburgh* in *November* 1646. when the Question came to be debated, whether they should own the King, or recall their Army from *England*, and leave him to the English; the Presbyterians opposed the King's Affairs with no little Fervour and Zeal. The King's party in Parliament was at first so considerable, that had the question been proposed at the downsitting thereof, the business had been carried for the King, by at least Thirty Voices, as some of the King's Friends did then compute, by trying the Pulse of the Commissioners.

Dr. Burnets Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton Pag. 284.

missioners. But for fear matters should go for the King, the Presbyterians were very busie and industrious, in drawing away many that adhered still to the King's Interest; and for this end Published a Declaration, tending to keep in with the English Parliament, and not to own the King. And by their Interest in this Parliament they got it Enacted, that their Army should withdraw out of *England*, and leave the King to the English, without any Conditions for his Interest. Now the Guilt of this Act cannot in Reason be imputed to any but the Presbyterian Party, and no ways to the generality of the Nation; because, as to the Nobility, the Third part of them was not present at that *Sedenunt*; many having been excluded for their known Affection to the King, and others upon other pretexts. And some withdrew from the Parliament of their own accord, being on the one part resolved not to comply, and on the other loath by their dissent to offend the prevailing Faction, lest they should incroach upon their Fortunes. And as for the Gentry and Commonalty throughout the Nation (*Fyfe* and the Western shires being excepted) there were a hundred to one that abhorred it, and would never have instructed their Commissioners that way, but were so overawed, that they durst not challenge them.

Bishop Guthries *History of the Civil Wars in Scotland*, MS.

But the opposition of this Party to the King's Affairs will further appear, if we consider their Behaviour, with Relation to the Engagement in *Scotland*, for Rescuing the King's Person. In *April* 1648, the Parliament of *Scotland* being informed of the Rude and Barbarous Treatment which the King received from the English Parliament and Army; and hearing that they had made him Prisoner in the Isle of *Wight*; they Voted, That they should demand the King to be brought from his Prison to *London*, or thereabout in Honour, Freedom and Safety. And having for this Effect dispatched *Lieutenant Collonel Marshal* to the Parliament of *England*, with a Remonstrance of their Breaches; they concluded and Voted a Levy of 30000 Foot and 6000 Horse, of which *Duke Hamilton* was made General. But the Presbyterians expressed very great dislike of, and solemnly protested against all that was resolved, and sent strict Orders to all their Disciples, that they should on the last *Sabbath* of *May* keep a Publick Fast against that Course, requiring them withal, not to comply in any sort for furthering this Levy, under pain of the Highest Censure; and their Ministers did in the mean time, Thunder Curses against all who should joyn in this Engagement. And when the Noblemen and others in Command over the Army, were hasting to bring forth their Regiments, that

Bishop Guthries *History*.

Dr. Burnets *Mem. of the Dukes of* Hamilton Pag. 337, 339 348.

they

they might March into *England*; a great Number of Western people Assembled in Arms against them at *Maueblin*, under the Command of some Presbyterian Ministers, Viz. *Mr. Will. Adair*, *Mr. Will. Guthry*, *Mr. Gabriel Maxwel*, and *Mr. John Nevoy*. *Middleton* being sent against them with some Troops of Horse, these Ministers parlied with him, but were so violent, that they would needs Fight it; but the Fight lasted not long, for *Middleton* in an instant put them all to the Rout; and yet dealt so mercifully with them, that such as he took Prisoners, he dimitted without any suffering. The Army under the Command of *Duke Hamilton* being Marched into *England*, the Gen. Ass. met at *Edinburgh July* 12. and Published a Declaration against the Army, proving the sinfulness and unlawfulness of the *Engagement*. And upon Notice, that this Army was Defeated by *Cromwel* at *Preston* in *Lancashire*; the West Country upon the first Notice of this Defeat, got instantly to Arms, with a design to cut off the remainder of this Army, and upon the Head of this Rebellious Multitude, were Mr. *David Dick*, and the rest of the Presbyterian Ministers in those parts. Thus did they Treat that Loyal Army which had Assembled themselves together, to Rescue his Majesties Sacred Person from the hands of his Cruel and Blood-thirsty Murderers. Here we have a clear view of the Behaviour of the Presbyterian Party towards the Royal Martyr K. *Charles* I. how they acted against his Majesties Interest, in a direct opposition to the whole Body of the Nation. When the whole Kingdom, even those who had formerly been deluded by the rest of the Rebels, with the False and Hypocritical pretences of Reformation, did unanimously embrace the King's Interest; the Presbyterians were so far from being sensible of their Sin and Folly, that they acted against him with the utmost Rigour of Malice and Envy. And yet these Men have now the Confidence to protest, *They had no hand in bringing him to his Death*, as if the History of these times were quite forgot, and no publick Monuments of their Treasonable and Rebellious Actings against that Prince remaining to their Eternal Infamy and Reproach.

Dr. Burnet *Ibid. p.* 353.

Bishop Guthries *Hist.*

But this is not all the countenance and encouragement these Barbarous Parricides Received from our Presbyterians. For when the News came to *Scotland* of a Treaty, begun betwixt the King and Parliament of *England*; Mr. *Rob. Blair* and Sir *John Cheesly* were presently dispatched away, by Order of the Presbyterian Ministers to joyn with *Cromwel*, in obstructing the Treaty. And upon their Arrival there with two other Commissioners, *Viz.* The *Earl of Lothian*

Bishop Guthries *Hist.*

Lothian, and *Will. Glendinning*, from the Committee of Eſtates, *Cromwel* began to ſhew himſelf for cruſhing the Treaty; he drew up his Army towards *London*, and ſent in a Remonſtrance to the Parliament, ſhewing his diſallowance of the Treaty, and craved Juſtice (as he call'd it) to be done on the King. Now theſe Presbyterian Commiſſioners not only concurred with *Cromwel* in this Remonſtrance againſt the King, but likewiſe remained at *London*, during the whole time of the King's Tryal and Execution, and never offered to Remonſtrate againſt the Unjuſt and Unnatural proceedings againſt his Majeſty. They did indeed ſend down to *Scotland*, for Inſtructions relating to the King's Tryal; and they were Ordered to endeavour the procuring a delay; but in the mean time to be cautious not to offend the prevailing Party in *England*. I know the Presbyterians will here pretend, that the Guilt of this Act cannot be charged upon them ſolely, ſince their Commiſſioners from the Kirk Acted nothing in reference hereto, but in conjunction with the Commiſſioners from the Committee of Eſtates. But here we muſt conſider, that the Committee of Eſtates did now wholly conſiſt of the Presbyterian Party; the reſt of the Members not daring to appear, by Reaſon of their known Affection and Loyalty to their Prince. For when the Scots Army was Defeated by *Cromwel* at *Preſton*, many of our Noblemen and Gentlemen were unfortunately killed in the Action; others to a great Number taken Priſoners, and ſuch as had the Fortune to make their eſcape, were forced either to abſcond or flie the Country, to avoid the ſeverities with which the Presbyterian Party, who now had Uſurped the Government of the Nation, did perſecute all ſuch as were concerned in this Engagement for the Defence of the King's Perſon. And by this means the Presbyterians got the whole management of the affairs of the Kingdom into their Hands, and acted there as they Liſted; ſo that, although the Committee of Eſtates as well as Commiſſion of the Kirk, ſent Commiſſioners to concur with the Kings Murderers in *England*, yet the Guilt and ſhame of this Act, cannot in any Reaſon be imputed to the generality of the Nation, but only to the Presbyterian Crew, whoſe actings have always tended to bring their Country into Diſgrace and Contempt.

From hence, I think it clearly appears, that the Horrid Murder of this Royal Martyr, is juſtly chargeable upon none of our Nation but the Presbyterian Sectaries; and the like may be made evident, in Relation to the Kingdom of *England*, that the Presbyterians and other Sectaries of that Nation, were the only Actors of

that

that dismal Tragedy, and did most cruelly Persecute the Church of *England* and its Members, for persevering in their Allegiance and Duty to their Sovereign.

The behaviour of the Scots Presbyterians towards K. Charles II. upon his advancement to the Throne.

But let us in the next place see what the behaviour of this Party was towards K. *Charles* II. upon his advancement to the Throne; for our Author tells us, That *what they suffered on his Account every body almost knows.* That our Presbyterians did consent to the proclaiming of *Charles* II. King upon the News of his Fathers Murder is true, but their Loyalty in this point, was clogg'd with such Restrictions and Limitations, as was not easie for the King to comply with. They forc'd him, before his Admission to the Crown, to Sign a Declaration, signifying his Penitency for the Sins of his Forefathers, in opposing the Work of God, and his own in so long following their Footsteps, with a Resolution to accomplish and prosecute the *Covenant*, in all its ends and purposes, which also for the more security, they caused him to take and Swear. And because his Majesty did at first refuse to Sign this Declaration; the Commission of the Kirk did on the 13 of *August* 1650 Publish a Declaration commonly called *the Act of the Westkirk*, wherein they declare they will not Espouse any Malignant Party or Quarrel, and that they will not own the King nor his Interests, otherwise than with a Subordination to God, and so far as he owns and prosecutes the Cause of God, and disclaims his and his Fathers opposition to the Work of God, and to the Covenant, and likewise disowns all the Enemies thereof. And in prosecution of this Declaration, when the Kingdom had resolved to call home K. *Charles* II. and for that End had admitted to favour, those who formerly were banished the Court and Nation as Malignants; this gave the Zealous and bigotted Covenanters so great Offence, that they protested against all the present proceedings, and declared that they had, contrary to the solemn League and its ends, admitted to the Throne *Charles Stuart*, who was an Enemy and Opposer of the quiet of their State and Kirk. And this Rigid Party having drawn to a Head in the West, in the year 1650, *Oct.* 17. they Penned and Subscribed a Paper, which they called a *Remonstrance of the Gentlemen, Commanders and Ministers attending the Forces in the West*, which they delivered into the Committee of Estates, and from which afterwards they got the Name of Remonstrants. Hence we see how this Merciful Prince was Treated by them in the very infancy of his Reign; and what further disquiet and disturbance they afterwards occasioned him, is but too Notorious, from the many Insurrections they

they raiſed againſt his Government, and which occaſioned the Enacting of thoſe Laws, the ſeverity of which they now ſo grievouſly complain of. What theſe Sufferings were which this Author alledges the Presbyterians met with for adhering to K. *Charles* II. I muſt confeſs I am altogether ignorant of, unleſs he means, that ſome of the more moderate of their Party were willing to own the King after he had taken the Covenant, and therefore upon that account ſuffered in the common Calamity with the reſt of the Nation, when *Cromwel* with the *Engliſh* Army invaded our Kingdom, defeated our Forces, and oppreſſed all that ſtood in any ſort ſuſpected of the Crime of *Loyalty*. But it is evident from the Hiſtory of theſe Times, that the generality of the Presbyterians were ſo far from being forward in owning the King's Intereſt, that at the ſame time when *Cromwel* was ſo ſucceſsful in the South of *Scotland*, as to have all beſouth *Forth* under his Dominion, great numbers of them were aſſembled in Arms in the Weſt, and remonſtrated againſt the Nation for owning the King's Intereſt. And this much of the Loyalty of our Presbyterians.

That the Engliſh Convocation acted upon far better Grounds in refuſing an Union with the Diſſenters, than the Scots Aſſembly in rejecting the Addreſſes of thoſe few Epiſcopal Clergy who addreſſed them, proved by ſeveral Reaſons.

This Author, *Pag.* 53. to juſtifie the Proceedings of their late General Aſſembly, in refuſing to admit ſome of the Epiſcopal Clergy into a ſhare of their Government upon the Terms deſired by K. *William*, urges, *That they did nothing but what the Church of England Convocation had done before them, who refuſed to admit the Diſſenters on the ſame King's deſire.* It were no ſmall preſumption in me to offer any Vindication of the Proceedings of thoſe learned and worthy Meembers of the Convocation in *England*, who at that time oppoſed the deſigned Comprehenſion of the Diſſenters; but I think I may be allowed to ſay, that they went upon far better Grounds than our pretended General Aſſembly, who refuſed to receive ſuch of the Epiſcopal Clergy as condeſcended to addreſs them upon that account. I am not concerned here to enquire into the Lawfulneſs of what theſe Epiſcopal Addreſſers did, in deſiring to be united with the Presbyterians in the Government of the Church, I ſhall not here ſo much as enter upon that Queſtion. My buſineſs at preſent is, only to ſhew, that the Presbyterians of *Scotland* are far more inexcuſable in denying the Requeſt of theſe Epiſcopal Miniſters that addreſſed them, than thoſe of the *Engliſh* Convocation who obſtructed the Union with the Diſſenters upon the Terms that were then propoſed; and my Reaſons are theſe.

First,

First, The Diſſenters in *England* never offered any Addreſs to the Convocation, declaring their Willingneſs to return to the Churches Communion, upon her laying aſide the uſe of theſe innocent Ceremonies which they pretend they cannot in Conſcience comply with. Had the Presbyterians given but the leaſt intimation of their readineſs to abandon their Schiſm upon the making of theſe Alterations, the Clergy perhaps, to further ſo deſirable a Work, might have eaſily been induced to grant them ſome Eaſe as to their unreaſonable Scruples about thoſe harmleſs Rites uſed in our Worſhip, which tho' indifferent in their Nature, yet are very ſignificant in their Uſe. But it is to no purpoſe ever to expect to reclaim the Presbyterians from their Schiſm upon ſuch Terms, ſince they declare againſt the whole Body of the Common-Prayer, and the Order of Epiſcopacy, as unlawful; and therefore to make Alterations in the manner of our Worſhip, which could have no other effect but to create more Enemies to our Communion, was no ways conſiſtent with the Prudence that is required in Eccleſiaſtical Governours. Now this is what the *Scots* Aſſembly cannot urge in their Defence, ſince thoſe of the Epiſcopal Clergy, who had the freedom to joyn with them in the Government of the Church, Petitioned them upon that account, and declared their readineſs to concur with them in maintaining the Diſcipline of the Church, and puniſhing ſcandalous and contumacious Offenders, which were all the Acts of Government they deſired to ſhare with them in. As for their Presbyterian Ordinations, they did indeed declare poſitively againſt them, and refuſed to joyn with them in any ſuch Acts as they thought to be direct Encroachments upon the Epiſcopal Power.

But, Secondly, There is another Reaſon which may have influenced the *Engliſh* Convocation to oppoſe the Alterations in the form of our Worſhip, which K. *William* did then deſire them to make, and that is, *The Preſervation and Safety of the whole Liturgy*. They were at that time ſenſible of the fatal overthrow of their Neighbouring Church of *Scotland*, how the Order and Conſtitution of its Government was quite overturned by the Presbyterians, and not only the Biſhops turned out both of their Spiritual and Temporal Rights, but likewiſe the greateſt part of the Clergy moſt barbarouſly Treated, and driven from their Houſes and Churches. This cruel Treatment which their Brethren in *Scotland* received from that Diſſenting Party, might juſtly alarm the *Engliſh* Clergy to expect the ſame Uſage from the Presbyterians here, as ſoon as they could thruſt themſelves into the power of doing them any miſchief. And therefore conſidering the

the great Intereſt the Presbyterians had in that firſt Parliament after the Revolution, it was no ways ſafe for the Convocation to conſent to the Diſſolving of the preſent Act of Uniformity, leſt they ſhould meet with ſuch Obſtacles in eſtabliſhing another, as they were hardly able at that time to grapple with. The Presbyterian Members of that Parliament were ſo numerous, that had the preſent Act of Uniformity been once diſſolved, they would have thrown in ſo many Stops and Hinderances againſt a new Eſtabliſhment of the *Liturgy* by Act of Parliament, they would have ſtarted ſo many new Scruples of Conſcience to be ſolved about it, and by this means occaſioned ſuch infinite delays therein, as would have made the Re-ſettlement of our Liturgy, a thing almoſt impoſſible. If the Parliament had offered to ratifie the *Service-Book* with the Alterations the Convocation ſhould think fit to make therein, before they Diſſolved this preſent Act of Uniformity, I cannot tell but many Members of that Convocation might have been prevailed with to Conſent to ſome Alterations in thoſe indifferent Ceremonies the Presbyterians ſo groundleſly exclaim againſt; that for the future they might not have the leaſt pretence for continuing in their notorious and wretched Schiſm. But for the Convocation to conſent to the Diſſolving the preſent Eſtabliſhment, without having any ſecurity for another, is what none could expect from any prudent or reaſonable Society.

Thirdly, The Convocation in *England* might perhaps be the more remiſs in promoting an Union with the Diſſenters upon the Terms propoſed, becauſe they ſaw no probability of preſerving thereby the Unity of the Church, as long as the Presbyterians profeſs to own no common Principles of Unity with us, that may ſtill oblige them to remain in the Communion of the Church. Unleſs they acknowledge our Biſhops to be the Principles of Unity, and that it is neceſſary for every one that intends to continue a Member of the Catholick Church to be united in their Communion; I ſay, unleſs they own theſe Catholick Paincipples of Unity in common with us, we can have no ſecurity that they will remain ours any longer than their Intereſt, ſhews them their Duty. And therefore an Union with them upon any other Terms, in ſtead of preſerving the Unity of the Church, would be a ready way to enable them to make a greater rent and breach in our Communion, whenever they ſhould ſee it their Intereſt again to erect Altar againſt Altar. But our *Scots* Aſſembly could have no ſuch Pretence againſt thoſe few Epiſcopal Clergy that deſired to be United to them in a ſhare of the Government.

They were willing, I suppose, to own the same common Principles of Unity with the Presbyterians, in reference to the Discipline of the Church, that is, to be governed by the major part of all their Assemblies, and to submit always to what is carried by a Plurality of Voices in their Meetings; though sometimes they themselves, when they see it for their Interest, destroy this Principle of Unity, so fundamentally necessary to all Democratical Societies, and allow the lesser Number to preponderate the greater, as in the Case which happened in the Synod of St. *Andrews*, *an.* 1591, about settling a Minister at *Leuchars*. And this methinks is enough to shew, that the Church of *England* had far more reasonable Grounds to oppose the Comprehension with the Dissenters, than the *Scots* Presbyterians had to reject the desire of the Episcopal Addressers. But this Author will needs have the Disadvantage appear wholly on the Church of *England*'s side, and therefore we must consider a little the Reasons he brings for his Assertion.

It is from the Civil Magistrate the Church derives all her Temporal Priviledges, but he is in no ways the Fountain of her Spiritual Power.

His first Reason is, *Because the King is really the Fountain of all their Church Power, as having the making of the Bishops, and does still remain Head of their Church; whereas he hath actually renounced Name and Thing in* Scotland, *where the whole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is by Law settled in the Church.* The King is indeed owned by the Church of *England* to be in his own Dominions Supream over all Persons, and in all Causes Civil and Ecclesiastical; but that he is the *Fountain of all their Church Power*, is what I believe the most Erastian Principled among them never dreamed. Their 37th Article asserts the contrary in as plain words as can be desired, where it is said, "That "they give not to their Princes the Ministring either of God's "Word, or of the Sacraments, but that only Prerogative which "they see to have been always given to all godly Princes in holy "Scriptures by God himself; that is, That they should rule all "Estates and Degrees committed to their Charge by God, whe-"ther they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the "Civil Sword the stubborn and evil Doers. From whence 'tis plain, that the Church of *England* in her Articles allows the Civil Magistrate no Power or Jurisdiction in Matters purely Spiritual; he cannot Administer the Sacraments, nor Consecrate either Bishops or Priests, neither can he inflict any Spiritual Censures upon obstinate Offenders. The Civil Power may for strengthening the Hands of the Church, and making her Discipline the more dreaded and regarded, inforce her Spiritual Censures with Secular Punishments, but can lay no claim to the Power of the Keys as his own Right.

It

It is from him the Church derives that Power of having Civil Penalties inflicted on such as contemn and despise the Ecclesiastical Censures; as in the case of Excommunication, which renders the Party excommunicated obnoxious to Temporal Imprisonment, and incapacitates him from carrying on any Suit or Action in the Civil Courts. The Church cannot by her own Authority use the Civil Sword to punish the stubborn and evil Doers; and therefore in so far as the Civil Magistrate extends the Churches Jurisdiction to some Secular Matters, and impowers her to inflict Civil Penalties for the better preserving of her Ecclesiastical Discipline, the Clergy must own the King to be the Fountain from whence they derive this Power. But as for their *Spiritual* Authority and Jurisdiction, which only can be called properly the *Church Power*, they derive it from a higher Original, from God himself, who is the true Head of our Church, and it cannot be conveyed to us by the Hands of any Lay-Person. God has instituted a distinct Order of Men in our Church, whom he has authorized to transmit this Spiritual Power down through all the Ages of Posterity, that there might still be a constant Succession of Pastors and Governors in the Church to administer his Word and Sacraments to his People. And it is from this Sacred Order of the Divine Appointment that our Clergy derive their Spiritual Power; it is from their hands they receive Holy Orders, and a Power of Ministring in Holy Things, and none but they alone can Divest them of this Authority.

Our Author's Expression, of *the King's having the making of the Bishops*, is somewhat ambiguous. If he means, that the King is allowed by the Church of *England* a Power to Consecrate and Separate the Bishops for their Sacred Function, it is such a notorious Falshood as needs no Confutation, the practice of the Church to the contrary being so visible. But if his meaning is, That the King has Power to Nominate any Clergy-man to a vacant Bishoprick, it is no more than what they themselves allow to the Laity in their popular Elections. And if the Laity in these Elections may be allowed to Nominate their own Pastor and Spiritual Guide, I see no reason why the Church should be blamed for allowing the King to Nominate and Recommend to them a Person fitly Qualified for the Sacred Office of a Bishop, especially since 'tis to his Bounty they owe all the Temporal Priviledges and Honours which are annexed to the Episcopal Sees.

An account of the King's Supremacy in Scotland, *as it is there Eſtabliſhed by the Laws of the Kingdom.*

The ſame Power in the external ordering of Spiritual Matters, with which the King is Inveſted by the Conſtitutions of this Church and Nation, does likewiſe belong to him by the Laws of *Scotland*. He has the Power of Nominating the Biſhops, and 'tis by his Authority the Clergy of that Kingdom are allowed to meddle in Secular Matters, and to inflict any Civil Penalties upon ſuch as deſpiſe their Spiritual Cenſures. What this Author alledges about the Reſcinding of the whole Supremacy in *Scotland* by Act of Parliament ſince this Revolution, is a groſs miſtake, as may eaſily appear from this ſhort Narrative thereof. By the 12 9th *Act*, *Parl.* 8. K. *James* VI. the King's Royal Prerogative of Supremacy over all Eſtates, as well Spiritual as Temporal, is acknowledged and ratified; and it is declared, That none ſhall decline the King's Power in the Premiſſes under the pain of Treaſon. Thereafter by the 1. *Act*, 2. *Parl.* K. *Charles* II. there is an Explication of this Act and Prerogative, whereby it is declared, That whatever Conſtitution the King ſhall make concerning the ordering and diſpoſing of the external Government of the Church ſhall be obeyed as Law. This laſt Act was thought to give the King too much Power, ſince he might thereby have aboliſhed the Government of the Church by his own immediate Authority, and ſo there was ſome pretext for Reſcinding this laſt Act, and it is Reſcinded by the firſt Act of the ſecond Seſſion of Parliament of K. *William*; but the firſt Act is not Reſcinded, and there was an expreſs Order to the Commiſſioner not to conſent to any Act in prejudice thereof. So that the King then, by virtue of the firſt Act, continues to have a Supremacy over all Eſtates Eccleſiaſtical as well Civil, and over all Perſons and Cauſes thereto relating, and the Clergy of *Scotland* are as much bound to own this Supremacy as thoſe of *England*. Here I cannot but obſerve how viſibly the Diſloyalty and Enmity of this Party to all Civil Government does appear. They endeavour, under pretence of lodging all Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction in the Church, to diveſt the King of that Power in the external ordering of Church Matters, which does duly belong to him as being the ſupreme Governor within his own Dominions; and yet they are ſo far from ſettling the whole Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction in the hands of Spiritual Perſons, as they pretend, that they have not ſo much as one Judicatory but what does conſiſt of at leaſt half as many Laicks as thoſe who pretend to be Eccleſiaſticks. They will not allow the King ſo much Power as to Convocate the Clergy for the ordering of Matters about Religion when he thinks fit, or to Command them faithfully to diſcharge their Duties and Functions, which he may lawfully do, by virtue of his Civil Power over their Per-

Persons as his Subjects, and yet they allow the Lay-Elders in their General Assemblies to share with them in the Authority of inflicting Spiritual Censures, which properly belongs to none but Spiritual Persons; and their indulging the Laity this Power in spiritual matters, is more than what they can well account for, according to the first Institution of the Ministry. In their General Assemblies there is no Minister deprived of his function, no Sentence of Excommunication passed, no Heretick condemned, nor any thing of moment transacted, but what their Lay-Elders share in as much as their Teachers; and yet if the King should desire any such Power in their Meetings, they would be apt to fly in his Face as an Oppressor and Persecutor of the Cause of God; but methinks they might at least indulge him the Honour of being one of their *Ruling Elders*.

The Church has the sole Power in matters purely Spiritual, but the Clergy are equally subject to the Civil Authority, and liable to the same punishments with the Laity.

That the Church has Power of calling her Assemblies, and exercising her Discipline in some extraordinary Cases, even contrary to the Command of the Civil Magistrate, is what we do not deny, as this Author is pleased to alledge. The Apostles and Primitive Christians did in a direct opposition to the Roman Emperours and Jewish Sanhedrim, frequently meet together to perform the Religious Exercises of Devotion, and determine such Controversies as then happened to arise among their Brethren, and this they did without thinking, that they encroached in the least upon the just Rights of the lawful Powers then in being. And what was lawful for them to do, is still lawful for the present Church in the same Circumstances; for the Magistrates being now Christian, can Intitle him to no greater Power in Church matters, by Virtue of his Civil Authority, than what did belong to the Heathen Magistrates. The Church may indeed upon prudent Motives, indulge the Christian Magistrate a greater Power of meddling in Ecclesiastical matters, than what had been either Prudent or Safe, to intrust the Heathen Emperours with; but this Power which the Church Grants to the Magistrate, does no ways belong to him, by Virtue of his Civil Authority; it is only Indulged him by the Church, in prospect of his Temporal Protection; and therefore, whenever he instead of a *Nursing Father* to her, shall turn an oppressing Persecutor, or when the Church shall see it any way necessary for the well being and safety of Religion, she may recal it again at her pleasure. But as we allow the Church to have the sole Power and Authority in matters purely Spiritual; so we deny, that any such independent Jurisdiction belongs to her, as to exempt the Bodies of the Clergy, from

from Subjection to the Civil Powers. They owe their Sovereign the same Duty and Obedience with the rest of his Subjects, are as much under the Jurisdiction of his Civil Courts, as liable to the Temporal punishments which he inflicts, as the persons of the Laity; for otherwise the Civil Magistrate could have no security for his Government.

The Papists and Presbyterians extend the Churches Authority beyond its true bounds, in claiming an exemption to the Clergy from secular punishments till they be first condemned by the Church.

We do not allow the Clergy to be Judges of every thing done by themselves in the first instance, which is the height of the Popish Usurpation and Supremacy, and makes Church-men no Subjects. And herein it is, that we differ from the Presbyterians in asserting the Jurisdiction of the Church; they together with the Papists carry it to such a height, as to claim an exemption for the Clergy of their not being answerable to the Civil Courts of the Nation, but only cognizable by themselves; they deny the secular Magistrate any Power to punish the persons of the Clergy, for Rebellion and Treason preached openly from their Pulpits, or any other Crime, till they once be Convicted of the Crime and Condemned therefore, by a sentence of an Ecclesiastick Judicatory. That this is, or at least was always wont to be, the constant Principle of the Presbyterian Party is so Notorious, that I admire this Author should ever attempt to conceal it. Was it not their proceeding to practice upon these principles, which gave the first Rise to that Act of Parliament in K. *James* VI's Reign, ratifying the King's Supremacy? For one Mr. *And. Melvil* a Presbyterian Minister, having declaimed frequently against the King, for which being called before the Council, he boldly declined the King and Council as Judges *in prima instantia* of what is Preach'd in the Pulpit, even tho' it were High Treason, and so he fled into *England*. Whereupon the Nation Assembled in Parliament in the year 1584, in a just Resentment of these Seditious Doctrines and Practices, did pass the abovementioned Act of Supremacy; and it was by Vertue of that very Act that Mr, *Ja. Guthrie* a Presbyterian Minister, was *anno* 1661 hanged for declining the King's Authority. The Presbyterian Ministers declaimed against and reproached this Act of Parliament, and in opposition thereto, one of their Number Mr. *Dav. Black*, having Railed against K. *James* and Queen *Elizabeth* from the Pulpit as Enemies to God, being called before the King's Council, he not only declined the King's Power of judging him, until he was first Condemned by his Brethren, but United most of the Ministers of *Scotland* most tumultuously in his Defence; and some of them who were then residing at *Edinburgh*, stirred up the multitude to such a

Rage

Rage and Fury upon this occaſion, that they preſently leapt to Arms, and came to the Street in great Numbers crying, *The Sword of the Lord and of* Gideon, *it ſhall either be theirs or ours.* And taking their March ſtreight to the *Seſſion-Houſe*, where the King and his Counſellors were then met, would in all probability have forced the Doors (which upon the Noiſe of the Tumult were ſhut) and done no ſmall miſchief, were it not that, by the Providence of God, a Loyal party drawn together by the *Deacon Conveener* of the Trades kept them back for a while, till their Fury cooled a little; and in the mean time the Earl of *Marr* called from the Caſtle, a Company of Musqueteers to Guard the King's Perſon; upon the Notice whereof the multitude choſe to disband, and went away as confuſedly as they met. And whether ſuch practices as theſe be not directly to invade the Temporal Sword, and Uſurp the Power of the Civil Magiſtrate, I ſhall leave the Reader to Judge. And if the Popiſh Biſhops be guilty of the like practices with the Presbyterians, in encroaching upon the Rights of the ſecular Magiſtrate, it ought not in Reaſon to reflect upon the Biſhops of the Reformed Communion, ſince it is what we can be no more accountable for, than for the Barbarous and inhumane practices of the Presbyterian party, becauſe they pretend to be our fellow Chriſtians. It is to theſe unjuſtifiable principles and practices of the Papiſts and Presbyterians, that we owe all the encroachments that have been made upon the ſpiritual Power in theſe later days; for the Popiſh Clergy together with the Presbyterians, not being ſatisfied to aſſert only the independent Authority of the Church in matters purely Spiritual, have endeavoured to extend its Juriſdiction ſo far, as plainly to encroach upon the Rights of the ſecular Magiſtrate, and to ſubject the State to the Church, not only in Spirituals, but likewiſe in Temporals. And this on the other Hand has Tempted many of the Laity in theſe later Ages, (when Men are degenerated into ſuch an indifferency and lukewarmneſs about matters of Religion, that they look upon the Temporal concerns of this World, to be of far greater Value and Concern, than the Eternal Intereſt of our Souls) upon all occaſions to graſp at the Rights of the Church, and to Rob her of that Spiritual Power and Authority with which our Saviour has inveſted her independently of any humane Authority, and which to Uſurp from her is Sacriledge to the higheſt degree.

Spotſw. Ref. lib. p. 65.

Biſhop Guthries *Hiſt.*

The ſecond Reaſon our Author brings to prove the Church of *England* to be in the blame, for refuſing an Union with the Diſſenters, is, *That they believe moſt of the things in Controverſie to be indifferent*,

The Church of England guilty of no breach of promise, in refusing an Union with the Dissenters upon the Terms proposed.

rent, *whereas the Presbyterians look upon them as unlawful; and that the Church of* England *were under promise to King* James *to have done it.* That the Church of *England* had reasonable grounds to oppose an Union with the Dissenters upon the Terms then proposed, I think I have sufficiently evinced already. And that they are guilty of any breach of promise which they made concerning it, while King *James* was here, is what cannot well be alledged, since they were always willing to receive them into the bosom of their Church, and to Grant them all imaginable ease, as to their unreasonable Scruples which might be consistent with the safety of their Church and Communion. But to abolish the use of those Innocent and instructing Rites in our Worship, meerly to satisfie the groundless scruples of the Presbyterians, when they do not so much as offer to return to our Communion upon these Terms, is what no reasonable man can well expect. Our Author in this Paragraph seems to Tax the Episcopal Clergy with being addicted to *Arminianism* and *Socinianism.* As for the latter, I'm confident there are few of them tainted with these sort of principles; they entertain the true Notions of the Son of God, of his Divinity, his Incarnation and Passion, according as they are revealed unto us in the Holy Scriptures. And as to the controverted Doctrines about *Election*, *Reprobation*, &c. They are careful to observe St. *Paul's* Rule, not to be followers of *Arminius* in these things, any further than he is a follower of the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles.

The Presbyterian Ministers have often assumed to themselves a Power of making Peace and War.

That the Presbyterian Ministers have often assumed to themselves a power of making Peace and War, and have declared Engagements to defend the King's Person, Honour and Prerogative, which were made by the Parliament without their consent, to be unlawful, is so well known, that I think there needs no great Rhetorick to convince us of the Truth thereof, although this Author very confidently avers the contrary, *Pag.* 56. If we but Read the History of the late Civil Wars under King *Charles* I. we shall find, that in all these proceedings, the Parliament or Committee of Estates appointed thereby to Govern the Nation, never acted any thing in Relation either to Peace or War, but in conjunction with the General Assembly or Commission of the Kirk; or if they chanced to pass any Acts without their consent, they were instantly declared to be unlawful and of no Obligation. And to prove the Truth of this we need no more but consult their proceedings, in opposing the King's Affairs in the year 1648. for when the Parliament of *Scotland* had resolved on an *Engagement* for delivering the King's person

perſon from his Impriſonment in *England*, did not the Presbyterian Miniſters preſcribe ſome Articles to the Parliament, for carrying on this War againſt *England*, and becauſe the Parliament did not comply with their deſires herein, they ſolemnly proteſted againſt all they had reſolved on, and thundered Curſes and Damnation againſt all who did not oppoſe this *Engagement*. Burnets *Memoirs of the Dukes of* Hamilt. p. 337, 339.

Pag. 59. This Author is highly diſpleaſed with his Antagoniſt, for throwing upon the Presbyterian party the reproachful Term of *New Goſpellers*; and he cannot apprehend what can be found in the Presbyterian Writings to ground this Accuſation upon. But I think truly, when we conſider the Nature of moſt of their Diſcourſes upon Religion, the whole Tenour of their Sermons and Preachings, it is not without ſome ground, that they are Reproached with this diſtinguiſhing Character. I do not ſay, that they maintain wholly a New and a Singular Goſpel, but I am ſure they have ſo diſguiſed the Goſpel of our Saviour, from its Ancient Purity and Simplicity, that what they Preach, is vaſtly different from the Doctrine of the Purer and Primitive Ages of Chriſtianity. They have corrupted moſt of its Doctrines, with their Rude and Indigeſted Notions; they have transformed the Meek and Calm Spirit of the Goſpel, into a Spirit of Bitterneſs and Revenge, inſtead of converting their Swords into pruning Hooks and plow ſhares; they, to propagate their excentrick Notions of Religion, maintain it lawful to reſiſt the Supreme Powers, and rather than fail of their deſigns, to imbroil Nations into perpetual War and Bloodſhed. And this methinks is quite another Goſpel from what our Saviour has taught us in his Holy Scriptures, where we have not the leaſt encouragement to propagate Religion by force of Arms, or any ſuch indirect means. There we find nothing more frequently inculcated to the Chriſtian Converts, than a Spirit of Meekneſs and Humility, of Brotherly Love and Charity, and to live peaceably with all Men as much as in us lieth. We are not taught from thence, to proſecute with the utmoſt Rigour of Malice and Revenge, all ſuch as differ from us in the leaſt matters about Religion, but we are rather exhorted to reclaim them from their Errors, in the Spirit of Meekneſs and Charity. *The Presbyterians not without ſome ground ſtigmatized with the reproachful Term of New Goſpellers.*

CHAP. III.

It is not strange to see Persons, after they have murdered, robbed, or any way injured their Adversaries, to endeavour likewise to blacken them in their Fame and Reputation, the better to palliate their own wicked Actions against them.

I Come now to our Author's Third and Last Part, where he has heaped together a parcel of such Villainous and Prophane Stories, of such manifest Lies and Forgeries, as do plainly shew the Author to have abandoned all Sense of Morality and Religion, and to have prostituted his Conscience meerly to gratifie his Malice and Revenge. After he has in the former parts of his Book, almost in every Page, reviled the whole Body of the Episcopal Clergy and Gentry both in *England* and *Scotland* at a most ignominious rate, representing them all as *Drunkards* and *Whoremongers*, as wallowing in all Sins of Uncleanness and Impurity, he now assaults the Persons of some particular Clergy-men in *Scotland*, whom he endeavours now to wound in their Reputation and Honour, as his Party have already done in their Lives and Fortunes. It is no ways strange to see Persons when they have either murdered, robbed, or any way injured a Man, to endeavour to blacken him in his Fame and Reputation, to represent him as the vilest Monster, that so they may the better palliate and excuse their own wicked and hellish Practices against him. Could we ever expect that the Presbyterians, after they had once attempted, frequently threatned, and at last accomplished in a most barbarous manner, the murder of that great Primate Bishop *Sharp*, that they should, after this unparallel'd Villany of theirs, allow him the Character he deservedly bears of a *Religious*, *Prudent*, and *Godly Prelate*? Could we imagine they would deal more tenderly with his Reputation than they had done with his Life? On the contrary, we had good reason to expect that they would charge him with all the notorious Villanies their Malice could invent, as this Libeller very civilly Treats him, *Pag.* 64. So that we have no great reason to wonder at this infatiable Malice of our Presbyterians, that after they had raised a most furious Persecution against our Clergy, thrust them from their Spiritual Cures and Preferments, robbed them of their Temporal Fortunes and Estates, and cruelly treated their Persons, by murdering of some, and wounding of others; that their Malice should not stop here, but likewise extend it self to their Fame and Reputation, the most precious Jewel we possess; I say, we need not much wonder at this, since it is no more than what was necessary

ſary to crown their glorious Work of Reformation, that they might not only thereby the more expoſe the Perſons of our Clergy to further Ignominy and Contempt, but likewiſe might have ſome ſhew or pretence to colour their own barbarous Practices againſt them.

The Innocency of our Clergy ſufficiently vindicated from this Libeller's aſperſions, ſince in this preſent Perſecution againſt them by the Presbyterians, they cannot Inſtance in four of their number, againſt whom they could find the leaſt pretence to deprive them for Immoralities.

It is a ſufficient Vindication of the Clergy, whoſe Lives and Converſations this Author ſo maliciouſly attacks, at leaſt of all thoſe who are yet alive, that in this preſent Perſecution againſt them, raiſed and carried on by the Presbyterians with all the fury and malice that was poſſible, there were few or none of them deprived for their Immoral Lives and Actions. Their Adverſaries not only perſecuted them in their Perſons, but likewiſe endeavoured to blacken them in their Reputation by all the helliſh Arts they could contrive; they framed Libels againſt them, ſtuffed with all the groundleſs Stories they could poſſibly ſcrape together, and with all the Lies and Forgeries their Malice could invent; and yet after all theſe indirect means uſed by them to ſtain the Reputation of our Clergy, I verily believe, they cannot inſtance in four Perſons againſt whom they could find the leaſt pretence to deprive them for their *Immoralities*. And this, methinks, were enough to detect the falſhood of this Villain's Forgeries, and to vindicate thoſe of the Clergy whom he here aſſaults from the foul Aſperſions he ſo invidiouſly throws upon them. If theſe of the Clergy had been in the leaſt obnoxious in their Lives, could they have poſſibly eſcaped ſo critical a Cenſure of their Enemies, when they ſifted all their Acquaintances for Stories againſt them, and ripped up their Lives to their very infancy, and when nothing elſe could be found blameable in the whole courſe of their Lives, they charged ſome of them with their *Juvenilia*, and even thoſe they repreſented under a great number of aggravating Circumſtances which never had the leaſt ſhadow of Truth. Had I the good fortune of being acquainted with all the Clergy, who are here libelled by our Author, or a convenient opportunity of correſponding with theſe places where they reſided, I could fairly undertake to diſprove this Accuſer in moſt of the particulars of his Forgeries. But ſince I am at preſent deprived of the Advantages of ſuch a general Correſpondence as this requires, I muſt in this Vindication confine my ſelf to ſuch of the Clergy as I have either the happineſs of knowing, or have had occaſion more particularly to enquire into the Hiſtory of their Lives. And from what I ſhall diſcover as touching this Libeller's diſingenuous and unfair Dealing with reſpect to theſe Clergy, the Reader may eaſily gueſs how fairly and candidly he treats their

Brethren, and what credit is to be given to his Calumnies and Aſperſions upon them.

Many of our Clergy ſufficiently vindicated from this Libeller's accuſations, by the Author of an Appendix to a late Treatiſe, entituled, An Apology for the Clergy of *Scotland.*

What I deſigned upon this Subject, is in a great part anticipated by a late Treatiſe concerning our *Scots* Affairs, entituled, *An Apology for the Clergy of* Scotland, where the worthy Author in an Appendix to his Book has vindicated many of our Clergy from the Libels brought againſt them by this petty Scribler, and has given ſuch true and juſt Characters of them as all that know them will readily acknowledge to be their due. To this Appendix therefore I ſhall refer my Reader for an Anſwer to a great deal of what concerns the third Part of this ſcurrilous Libel, not being willing to repeat here what is ſo excellently ſaid by that Author in vindication of our Clergy. I ſhall only here ſubjoyn ſuch further Matter for their Vindication from this Libeller's Aſperſions, as the Author of the *Appendix* had not then the opportunity of knowing, and has ſince come to my hands.

Dr. Canaries *fully vindicated from the Calumny brought againſt him by this Accuſer, and the Accuſer's Malice and Diſingenuity fully deteſted.*

And firſt, As for Dr. *Canaries*, againſt whom the bent of this Accuſer's malice ſeems to be chiefly levelled, although I never gave the leaſt credit to this abominable Story charged upon him in this Pamphlet, as knowing him to be a Man of a virtuous and exemplary Life; yet becauſe the Libeller ſo confidently appeals for the truth of his Story to the Regiſters of *Dundee*, I had the curioſity to ſend thither to a worthy Friend of mine for an Extract out of the Regiſters concerning this matter, not doubting but our Author had conſulted the Records himſelf before he made ſo publick an Appeal to them. The Anſwer I received was to this purpoſe: That as for Dr. *Canaries*'s Affair, after all the Reſearches could be made into the Records of the Kirk-Seſſions and Presbytery of *Dundee*, there was no mention of it to be found there, and the Miniſters aſſured him never any thing of it was Recorded, ſo that he could not ſend me any Extract of it as I deſired. And he ſays, That it is great Impudence in the Author of this Pamphlet to appeal to theſe to gain credit to that abominable Story; as it is likewiſe moſt notoriouſly falſe what this Author alledges, That the Doctor was conſtrained to flee; for he averrs it as a certain truth, That there never was any Sentence pronounced againſt him, and this (he ſays) all the Miniſters of the Presbytery can atteſt. He likewiſe ſays, That his very Accuſers there do utterly deny that there was any ſuch thing as a Form of Baptiſm uſed, which is ſo confidently aſſerted by this Villain. He tells me, he was credibly informed, That the Fanaticks in that place had been at pains to ſift theſe Accuſers of the Doctor, and that Mr. *Spalding* the Presbyterian-Intruder there had ſent ſome of his Fol-

Followers to examine them concerning this matter, and after all they were brought to Mr. *Spalding* himself, but never would acknowledge any such thing as the Pamphleter records. He concludes his Letter thus; That he must do Dr. *Canaries* the justice to testifie, that he was as little tainted with Intemperance as any he knew of his age. And this Testimony ought to be of the greater weight with us, that it comes from one who was intimately acquainted with the Doctor, and had all the advantages of knowing exactly the whole Series and History of his younger Years.

When that Passage of the Doctor was Examined before the Presbytery of *Dundee*, the Doctor received an Acquittance from the Presbytery, clearing him from having any accession to that Scandal given by these two young Gentlemen who were in his company, and accosted the Women in the Fields. And notwithstanding the malice of the Presbyterians hath aggravated that Story into a heinous Villany, yet the true and real Ground of it was no more than this, That these two young Gentlemen being in company with the Doctor, run from him to some Women in the Fields, and undecently thrust their Hands under their Clothes. When this Answer to the *Presbyterian Eloquence* was published, Mr. *Castairs* a Presbyterian Minister told Dr. *Canaries*, that he was informed by Mr. *Spalding* the Presbyterian Preacher at *Dundee*, (the place where this Story had its rise,) That there was no ground for this malicious Calumny against the Doctor; and that if the Doctor pleased, he would write to Mr. *Spalding* for an account of it, which he thought would be such a Vindication of the Doctors Innocency, as the most malicious of his Enemies could not well withstand. Mr. *Castairs* having wrote to Mr. *Spalding*, who sent him up some account of it to *London*; he sent a Letter to the Doctor, acquainting him, That such an account was come from Mr. *Spalding* to *London*, (though not as yet to his hands) wherein the Doctor's Innocency was sufficiently cleared from this malicious Slander. This Letter from Mr. *Castairs* I suppose the Doctor hath in his possession; but Mr. *Castairs* sent not afterwards to the Doctor Mr. *Spalding*'s Letter, for what reason I shall not here enquire.

Hence we may see how fairly and candidly the Doctor has been treated by this malicious Scribler, and for no other reason that I can conceive, but his being employed by a part of the Clergy of *Scotland* to Negotiate their Affairs with the present Government, and the vigorous opposition he always made to the Designs carried on by the Presbyterian Party for overturning and subverting our Church.

I shall not here resume what the Author of the *Appendix* above cited brings in further Vindication of the Doctor's Innocency, as that he underwent two fiery Tryals before the Presbyterian Judicatories in *Scotland*, one before the Privy-Council at *Edinburgh*, which consisted then wholly of Presbyterians, who are still by far the majority at the Council-Board; the other before a Meeting of Presbyterian Teachers at *Selkirk*; by both which he was acquitted, and not one instance of Immorality laid to his charge. On the contrary, the Presbyterian Ministers offered cordially to receive him into their Society, if he would but renounce his Principles of Episcopacy. I think there needs no more be said in the Doctor's Vindication; if he but appeal for his Innocency to the Testimony of those who have known the whole course of his Life and Conversation, he may fairly bid a defiance to the most inveterate malice of his Enemies.

An account of Dean Hamilton's Process, and his being absolv'd therefrom by the Privy-Council and the Criminal Court.

Page 64. He charges Dean *Hamilton* with Sodomy, and says, He was convicted of it by 88 Witnesses; and again, *Pag.* 73. he accuses him *of buggering a Mare, lying with several Men's Wives in Hamilton*, and several other Immoralities, among which is his profering *Bestiality* (I suppose our Author would have said *Sodomy*) to a young Man in *London* of this Author's own Acquaintance. *These Crimes*, he says, *were proved against him before the Criminal Court at* Edinburgh, *but he having bribed the Judges, the Tryal was put off.* As for these last Crimes, *Buggery*, *Adultery*, *&c.* the Dean was never so much as accused of them, so far were they from being proved against him, as this Libeller falsly alledges; and it is the height of Impudence in him to arraign the whole Justice of the Nation at this rate, for conniving at such gross and scandalous Immoralities as the most barbarous Nations detest and abhor. Is it possible for any man of sense to believe, that the whole Judges of a Nation can be so degenerated in their Morals, as to be bribed or corrupted by such a vile Wretch as this Dean *Hamilton* must needs have been, had our Author's Calumnies against him been true? The Dean was indeed accused of the Crime of *Sodomy*, and upon that account was cited first before the *Privy-Council*, and afterwards before the *Justice-Court* at *Edinburgh*; and all Witnesses that could be had were examined against him, but they not proving any thing of the Crime upon him, he was fully absolved from it by both those honourable Courts. And my Informer assures me, that he has seen the Sentences of Absolution passed upon this Affair by both those Courts; the one signed by Duke *Hamilton* as President of the Council, and the Clerk to the Privy-Council; the other signed by the *Justice General*, and the Clerk to the

the Justice-Court; and these Sentences of Absolution are to be seen at this day in the several Registers of those Courts. Now, after the *Dean* was so publickly absolved from the Guilt of this Crime, it must needs argue a great stock of Impudence, and nothing less of Malice in this Author, to averr so confidently, *That he was convicted of it by eighty eight Witnesses.* Whether he was really guilty or not of such a Villany, God and his own Conscience can best tell; it has been the misfortune of several pious and innocent Persons to be falsely accused; but however, since he did so openly Vindicate himself from the Guilt of this Crime, the Laws of Christian Charity oblige us to look upon him as Innocent, till we have better Evidence to the contrary, than the Aspersions and Calumny of a malicious and virulent Scribler, who has declared himself an Enemy to all those that have ever been vested with the Authority of *Christ's Ambassadors.*

In the following Page * he mentions one Mr. *Boyd* a West-Country Parson, whom he affirms *to have got his Maid with Child*, and, *to have been taken in the Act by some of his Parishioners*, and *thereupon to have deserted his Wife, and run with the Whore to England.* In this our Author is so far mistaken, that I am credibly informed, there never was an Episcopal Minister of that Name in the West of *Scotland* since the Year 1662, except one Mr. *Robert Boyd* Minister at *Carmunoch*, who although upon some other accounts he was once Libell'd in Bishop *Leighton's* time and absolved, nothing of the Libel being proved, yet never any thing like *Adultery* was laid to his charge, and at present he lives in *Glasgow* with his Wife under a virtuous and commendable Character.

* *Page 65.* *Our Author's great mistake concerning Mr. Boyd.*

In the same Page our Libeller assaults the Reputation of Mr. *Hugh Blair* Minister at *Rutherglen*, concerning whom he has these Words; *That he was a common Drunkard and Swearer, and at last got his Maid with child, for which he was suspended about a month by the Bishop; but having bribed one* Macfarland *to marry the Whore, and say the Child was his, he was restored again to his Office, though the thing was proved before the Bishop by many Witnesses who had seen them lying together; and it was also proved, that the Woman owned it in her Labour, and that her Husband had confessed it.* I have chose the rather to set down our Author's Words at large, because they contain a complication of as many Lies as Words. That Mr. *Blair* is either a *Drunkard* or *Swearer*, was not so much as alledged against him in all his Process, which notwithstanding was carried on with the height of Malice and Envy. That he *got his Maid with child*, is a most notorious Lie, as I shall con-

A full Relation of the Process concerning Mr. Hugh Blair, and of the indirect ways and means used by the Presbyterian Party to stain his Reputation.

convince you by and by, as it is likewiſe falſe that the Biſhop ever ſuſpended him on that or any other account. That Mr. *Blair* bribed one *Macfarland* to marry the Whore, contains no leſs than two manifeſt Falſhoods; for Firſt, There was never one *Macfarland* mentioned in the whole Proceſs; and Secondly, The Whore lives ſtill unmarried to this day. That the thing was proved before the Biſhop by many Witneſſes that were examined about it, is likewiſe a notorious Untruth, for of above an hundred Witneſſes that were examined about it, not one of them depoſed that they ſaw him as much as ſpeak to her after he put her out of his Service, far leſs to have the leaſt ſcandalous carriage towards her. That *the Woman owned it on her childbed*, and *that her Husband confeſſed it*, are of the ſame ſtrain with the reſt of theſe Calumnies, and have no greater ſhadow of Truth; for when the Huſſie was in Childbed, ſhe declared one *Donald Ferguſon* to be the Father of the Child, who owned it as his, and maintained it as long as the Child lived. As to the Husband's confeſſing that he was bribed to own the Child, I have already told you, that the Woman was never known to have a Husband, and that ſhe lives unmarried at this day.

But that you may be the better able to underſtand the whole of this Affair concerning Mr. *Blair*, take the Hiſtory of it as follows. Mr. *Hugh Blair* being indebted for ſome money to one *James Macfarland* of *Kirk-town*, his own Couſin-German, and Mr. *Macfarland* having occaſion to write to him frequently about it, ſent a Servant of his called *Donald Ferguſon* with the Letters; and this Fellow ſtaying ſome times all night at Mr. *Blair*'s Houſe, had occaſion to debauch *Margaret Drew* one of his Maid-ſervants, and got her with Child, which ſo ſoon as Mr. *Blair* was informed of, he put the Huſſie out of his Service. Then Commiſſary *Fleeming* his Lady living in Mr. *Blair*'s Pariſh, and having had a former Grudge againſt him, laid hold on this occaſion, and dealt with the Whore to father the Child on Mr. *Blair*. And for that end, ſhe and the Fanatick Party in *Glaſgow* gave her a ſum of money to own it; (which can yet be proved by the Huſſie's own confeſſion, and by other Witneſſes that were privy to it;) upon which ſhe goes to a Miniſter in the Presbytery of *Glaſgow*, and affirmed Mr. *Blair* to be the Father of her Child. The rumour of this coming to the Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow* his ears, he forthwith appointed a Viſitation of the Church of *Rutheglen*, where Mr. *Blair* was Miniſter, to be in *April* 1663, and cauſed the Woman *Margaret Drew* to be ſummoned thereto. She appearing before the Presbytery, declared, That *Donald Ferguſon* was the Father of her

her Child. Whereupon Mr. *George Milne* Minister at *Campsie*, in whose Parish this *Ferguson* lived, was ordered to summon him to the next Presbytery Meeting; who compearing freely, owned himself to be the Father of the Child, and did satisfie the Discipline of the Church at *Govan* for the said Scandal, where both of them confessed the Child was begotten. When the Child was presented to Baptism, this *Ferguson* did the duty of the Father, and did likewise maintain it as long as the Child lived.

Commissary *Fleeming*'s Lady being disappointed of this her design against Mr. *Blair*, set another on foot of Libelling him; and procured from the Archbishop a second Visitation to be kept at his Church of *Rutherglen* by the Presbytery; where all his Parishioners that had any thing to say against his Life and Conversation, were invited to come freely and declare it: Yet even then his whole Parishioners cleared him of all Imputations both of Doctrine and Conversation. But our Presbyterian Lady's malice rested not so, for she procured a third Visitation, against which time she had provided one *William Robison*, a *Smith* to his Trade, and a proffigate vicious Fellow in his Morals, to give in a Libel against Mr. *Blair*, and accuse him of several Immoralities. This Fellow had been a Serjeant at the Insurrection of *Bothwel-bridge*; before which time Mr. *Blair* and his *Kirk-Session* had frequently censured him for *Drunkenness*, *Swearing*, *Breach of the Sabbath*, *Cursing*, *and Whoredom*; so that the Archbishop and Presbytery could not admit him as an Accuser. And this necessitated the Lady to set up one *John Widderspone* a Taylor to subscribe the Libel against him, who was a Bastard-relation of her own, at that time her servant, a young man not one and twenty Years of Age, having no Family, and not worth a Groat; yet notwithstanding all these just Exceptions against him, to give the Lady satisfaction, he was sustained. But after more than two years Process before *Synods*, *Sub-Synods*, *Presbyteries*, and the Examination of above an hundred Witnesses, there was not one Title of the Libel proved against him; even although no Witnesses were rejected, but all admitted, even Informers themselves, and one *John Steven*, whom Mr. *Blair* proved to be a Mad-man, was admitted *Cum Notâ*, as the whole *Synod* and *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* and their Registers can testifie. But all this failing them, the Lady again set on the Whore, and gave her more money to retract her former judicial Confession, and to father the Child on Mr. *Blair De novo*. Many Witnesses were procured by her, to prove that Mr. *Blair* bribed the Hussie with money. But all Proof failing, and she having thereby made her self Infamous,

the Archbishop, together with the whole Diocese, after three years Process, finding nothing of the Libel proved, nor any ground to trouble him further, did absolve him from the whole Libel and Process; all which the Registers to this day do bear, and all the Ministers of the Diocese yet living can attest. In this Process Commissary *Fleeming* and his Lady, their Oaths being taken, did confess that they had set out both *William Robison* and *John Widderspone* to accuse Mr. *Blair*, and given them money for that end; and this is contained in their Original Depositions upon Oath, subscribed with their own Hands. The *Commissary*'s own Original Deposition sign'd by himself, owns that he was instrumental in perswading *William Robison* to accuse Mr. *Blair* to the Presbytery, but denies that he knew any thing of *Widderspone*'s doing it till after he had begun it.

I have thought fit to trouble the Reader with an exact Copy of Commissary *Fleeming*'s Deposition upon Oath concerning this matter, because it contains a further confirmation of what I have already said in Vindication of Mr. *Blair*'s Innocence, and is a full discovery of the malicious and indirect means that were used by the Presbyterian Party to stain his Reputation. Here follows the Deposition.

Glasgow, May 1. 1684.

SIR William Fleeming *Commissary of* Glasgow *being called, compeared, and his Oath being taken, did acknowledge he desired* William Robison *to go in and inform the Presbytery against* Mr. Hugh Blair, *but that by the Oath he had made he knew nothing of* Widderspone's *doing any thing of that kind until he had entred on it. For Proveſt* Bowman, *he never called for him anent Mr.* Hugh Blairs *business so far as he remembers. He called for Proveſt* Harvey, *and enquired at him what he knew anent Mr.* Hugh Blair, *and he having told me what he knew, I answered, Why then you must be ready to depone according to your knowledge when occasion serves. And in the very like fashion he sent for Bailie* Fleeming, *according to his memory he thinks he called for* James Cuming, *and took Inquisition of what he knew anent Mr.* Hugh Blair, *and asked, Whether he would be a Witness or Informer, or either, and that he found satisfaction in neither, and that according to his memory all this was after the Visitation, but cannot be positive. He remembers nothing anent* William Scot *Weaver positively, and that by the Oath he had made he said, That* William Robison *should be at no loss by any Expences he should be at, but that he never*

never essayed money to Witnesses that he can remember, and that he never threatened any Witnesses to come in against Mr. Hugh Blair. *He sent for* Thomas Wilkie, *and asked him what he could say? And when he told him, he had him be ready, as he should answer to GOD to tell the Presbytery. And declares as to the Information he had, and as to the getting of an Accuser, he does not judge himself bound to give an account of his private Methods and Transactions therein, especially seeing the Presbytery required all the Heretors and others to inform what they could against Mr.* Hugh Blair, *but* Ex superabundanti, *for the Committee's satisfaction he had declared* Ut supra sic subscribitur.

W. Flyming.

The Commissary in the end of his Deposition says, That having interrogated *Thomas Wilkie* what he could say against Mr. *Blair*, perswaded him to be a Witness against him, implying as if this *Wilkie* could have discovered some material thing concerning Mr. *Blair*; whereas *Thomas Wilkie*'s Deposition upon Oath is rather a Vindication than an Accusation of Mr. *Blair*'s Innocence. He not only denies that he ever knew Mr. *Blair* guilty of any undecent thing with this Hussie, but swears positively that he heard Mr. *Blair* affirm, That if this Woman were with Child, he should take all imaginable care that she might appear and satisfie the Discipline of the Church for the Scandal. His Examination upon Oath signed by himself take as follows.

Glasgow, Dec. 26. 1683.

THE *whilk day* Thomas Wilkie *being admitted Witness and Interrogate, if he did see Mr.* Hugh Blair *riding before* Margaret Drew *on an Horse towards* Edinburgh? *Deponed thereto Negatively.* 2. *Being Interrogate, if he did see them sup together in* James Borland's *at* Blackburn? *Deponed thereto Negatively.* 3. *Being Interrogate, if he heard Mr.* Hugh Blair *say, if* Margaret Drew *were with Child, he should secure her Fees to his hims for her Competrance? To which he deponed Affirmative.* Sic subscribitur

Thomas Wilkie.

I think I need say nothing further in *Mr. Blairs* Vindication; whoever cosiders what is already said on that point, will be fully convinced of his Innocence as to all these Calumnies brought against him by this Libeller, he is not the first whose Fate it hath been to be maliciously and innocently slandered. I have not the happiness of being of Mr. *Blairs* acquaintance, but the Character under which I have heard him always represented by his Brethren and Neighbours, shews him to be a Man of a Virtuous Life, and of such Learning and Parts, as no Cause needs be ashamed to own him for one of their *Confessors*.

The Story of Mr. Chisholm truly related, and he cleared from this Calumny.

The next instance of which I shall take Notice, is Mr. *John Chisholm* Parson of *Lisly* in *Teviotdale*, whom this Libeller Accuses in these Words; *That he having got his Maid with Child, bribed a Mason to Marry her, and own it, but the Woman afterward going to a Field Meeting in the Neighbourhood out of Curiosity, was so stung in Conscience, on hearing the Famous Mr.* John Welch *Preach against such Immoralities, that she cried out to the disturbance of the Worship, that she was undone Eternally, and voluntarily confessed her Crime; for which she was pursued by the Episcopal Clergy, and imprisoned a long time, tho' she still owned the Guilt; and the same was also Attested by her Brother, who had been privy to his Villany.* This instance does furnish us with such a Notable Discovery of this Author's sincerity, and the Spirit of his party, that I very much wonder he had not the sense to pass it over, it reflecting such Scandal and Disgrace upon the whole Faction; and really it is hard to determine, whether the Impudence, Malice, or Folly of this Author be most discernible in it. For this whole Affair having Ministred matter of so much Talk to the whole adjacent Neighbourhood where it happened, upon the singular discovery of this calumnious Cheat of the Presbyterians, it could not possibly escape the knowledge, either of this Author, or his Informer; and yet so blind is the Spirit of Rage and Malice, that our Author would needs publish this instance, as one of the Scandals of the Episcopal Clergy, when he very well knows, that all the Scandal of it returned with a Witness upon their own Heads. But it seems the contriving this sham had cost them so great pains, that they were unwilling to lose the Fruit of so much Labour, even tho' the Mystery was now unfolded; hoping by such aspersions at least to impose upon Strangers, as before they had done for some time on the Neighbourhood, till that overruling Providence, which most frequently exerts it self in the Vindication of oppressed Innocence, brought to light that hidden Work of Darkness. The Story in short is thus.

Mr.

Mr. *Chisholm* had a Servant Maid in his House who happened to be with Child; she being conveened before the *Kirk-Session* declared who was the Father of her Child, the person on whom she Father'd the Child owned it to be his, and both she and the said Father did Pennance for this Scandal, according to the usual Custom as was enjoyned, and thereupon Received the Churches Absolution. Mr. *Chisholm* upon his Maids falling into this Scandal removed her from his Service, and afterwards the Lady *Cherrietrees* (a Zealous Presbyterian, and who would not let slip any occasion, of bringing Reproach on the Clergy, and rendring that Sacred Profession odious to the World) being, as appears from the sequel of the History, put upon it by the party, hires this Woman to be her Servant; and by some Arts or other prevails with her to say, that Mr. *Chisholm* her late Master was the Father of her Child. And to make the thing more clamorous, they perswade her to go to a Conventicle where Mr. *John Welch* Preached, and there, by all the hypocritical sorrow she could counterfeit, to pretend her self to be under an intollerable Remorse of Conscience for concealing the Sin of her Master. The Noise of this no sooner went abroad, than the Neighbouring Clergy took notice of it, and appointed the Woman to be Summoned to the Meeting of their *Presbytery*, whom, when she appeared, they interrogated, whether she owned what was commonly Reported she had said concerning Mr. *Chisholm's* being the Father of her Child? She answered she had said so, and that she now adhered to it, and that it was a Truth, that Mr. *Chisholm* had committed Fornication with her. This her bold Accusation did not a little amaze all those who had any familiar acquaintance with Mr. *Chisholm*, whom they had always Esteemed a Man of an inoffensive Life, having been of an unblameable and exemplary Conversation. His Brethren however in the mean time, because of the Scandal, did suspend him from the exercise of his Ministry, and used their utmost endeavours with him, to bring him to a Confession of his Guilt, and to perswade him to dimit his Office, his Ministry being, upon the Account of the Scandal he had fallen under, rendered altogether useless. But after the Process had been long depending, and he still continuing under the Suspension of the Exercise of his Ministry, did notwithstanding unalterably persist in his *Pleading not Guilty*, and did by such serious Protestations Remonstrate his Innocence to his Brethren, that they firmly believed him to be very much injured in this Affair. He told them, it was not to save his preferment that he stood so much to the Vindi-

cation

cation of his Innocence, but that his personal Reputation being highly wronged in this matter, and especially, there being so much Scandal and Reproach cast upon the Sacred Office of the Ministry upon his Account, he thought himself bound in Conscience to endeavour all he could, to have this Affair throughly Canvassed, that he might clear not only his own Reputation, but likewise the Ministerial Function of this great Scandal so maliciously thrown upon them.

After this, some of Mr. *Chisholm*'s Friends being throughly perswaded of his Innocence, thought fit to make Application to the Civil Power to take the matter under their cognizance; and spoke to the Sheriff of the place, that he might take some effectual course for having the Mystery of this whole Affair unfolded. The *Sheriff* sends for the Woman, and tells her, he had very good ground to suspect that what she Reported of Mr. *Chisholms*, being the Father of her Child was a meer Calumny and Forgery, she having at first declared another Man to be the Father of the Child, and this Man having owned the Child to be his, and they both having done Penance for the Scandal accordingly. She still persisting to say Mr. *Chisholm* was the Father of her Child, the *Sheriff* told her, there was no other way to clear this matter, but by her Oath, and therefore required her to hold up her Hand, (the way of Administring an Oath in *Scotland*) and solemnly to declare, whether Mr. *Chisholm* was the Father of that Child or not? The Hussie holds up her Hand, but finding that the *Sheriff* seemed to be in earnest to tender her the Oath, she presently pulls back her Hand, and refuses to Depose. The *Sheriff*, having from this her behaviour good ground to believe there was some Cheat in the business; proceeds to threaten her with the Torture, if she did not instantly disclose to him the whole Mystery of this Affair. Upon this the Hussie presently confesses, that Mr. *Chisholm* was not the Father of the Child, but that the Lady *Cherrietrees* (a Zealous Bigot for Presbytery) having taken her into her Service, prevailed with her to Father it upon Mr. *Chisholm*, and that the thing might be the more publick, to do Penance for it in a Field Conventicle. The *Sheriff* sends forthwith for the Lady *Cherrietrees* and imprisons her, and after having throughly Examined the matter, and finding her Guilty, he Fines her in the sum of above an hundred and sixty pounds Sterling.

In this we have an excellent proof of our Authors *Fair and Candid Dealing*, of which he so faithfully assures his Reader in the close of his Preface; and it likewise affords us a singular instance of the dis-

ingenuous

ingenuous Arts and Villanous practices of that Party, who never stick at any thing, nay, not the most Hellish and indirect means they can conceive, to stain the Reputation of their Adversaries, and to bring them into Contempt. As for the Truth of the story as I have here related it; I had it from a very Grave and Worthy person, who then lived near to the place where it happened, and was Eye-Witness to a great part of the Tryal, and so had all the advantages of knowing the Truth of this Affair. But this whole Story is so notorious and so very well known in that place of the Country, that I'm confident, our Adversaries can never have the Face to deny it. Besides, there was a very remarkable accident; some may perchance call it a *Judgment from God*, that happened in a short time after the discovery of this notorious Cheat, which made the whole story the more taken Notice of. It was concerning the Lady *Cherrietrees*, who had been the Author and occasion of all this trouble to Mr. *Chisholm*, and had perswaded his Maid to Father her Child upon him. For one of her own Confessors, a Presbyterian Minister, (his Name is but too well known) coming upon some occasion to lodge at her House, during the short time he stayed there, he committed Uncleanness with one of her neerest Relations and got her with Child; and both he and the young Gentlewoman did Pennance for this their Sin of Fornication in a Field Conventicle, held upon the same Hill, where the Lady *Cherrietrees* had obliged Mr. *Chisholms* Servant Maid to publish him as Father of her Child in their Presbyterian Congregation, and that it might bring the greater Scandal upon the Episcopal Clergy, to do publick Pennance for it there. You may be sure such a remarkable accident, as this would not easily pass without a critical Censure from all the Country round about.

This Affair of Mr. Chisholm's, a singular instance of the Villanous Arts and Practices of the Presbyterians to bring contempt on the Episcopal Clergy.

Pag. 79. Our Libeller misses a little of his Aim, for instead of an Episcopal Clergyman, he falls foul upon one of his own party, a Presbyterian Minister; however I think I'm in justice bound to set down what Information I have of that Affair; and to Vindicate the injured Memory, even of a Presbyterian Minister, from the Calumnies and Aspersions of those of his own Faction. His Name is Mr. *Waugh* Curate of *Borrostounness*, whom this Author affirms *to have Ravished his Wifes Neece.* I'm told indeed, that he was slandered with Adultery, and that a Woman Father'd a Child upon him, but she was neither a Married Woman, nor his Wives Neece; however, of this Accusation he purged himself by Oath, before the Presbytery of *Linlithgow*, as is to be seen in the Registers of that place.

Mr. Waugh a Presbyterian Minister, Vindicated from the Aspersions of this Libeller.

In

Another mistake of our Authors concerning Mr. Gregories *being Minister at* Torbolton.

In the next Paragraph he mentions one Mr. *Gregory* Curate of *Torboltoun*, who, he says, *was taken in the Act of Uncleanness on a Dunghil.* Whereas I'm inform'd, there was none of the Name of *Gregory*, Minister at that place. Mr. *James Gillespie* was Minister at *Torboltoun*, and Mr. *Alexander Gregory* Parson of *Air*. But they are both Men of an untainted Reputation, and were never so much as slandered with such a Crime, and far less convicted of it.

The notorious falshood of the Relation about Mr. Pearson.

The next whom he Attacks, is Mr. *Pearson*, Curate of *Pasley*, who he says, was seen in his own Garden committing Indecencies with his Wife. Whereas Mr. *Pearson* was three years Minister at *Pasley*, during all which time his Wife was never in *Pasley*, nor nearer to it than *Burntisland* in *Fyfe*, which is about fifty miles distance; and this all the Presbytery and Parish of *Pasley* can attest.

A Vindication of Mr. Lawson *Minister of* Yrongray.

The next I shall take Notice of, is Mr. *Lawson* Minister at *Yrongray*, whom this Libeller Accuses for *procuring Souldiers to be Quartered on his Parishioners, till they were quite eaten-up, and for informing against his Parishioners, and causing several of them to be Hanged.* The Falshood of this Accusation is so manifest, that Mr. *Lawson* challenges his Accusers to Name any one of his Parish that were hanged, during the twenty years of his Ministry at *Yrongray*, except one *Gordon*, who suffered for his Notorious Rebellion. And he was so far from procuring Souldiers to be Quartered on his Parishioners, that by his Intercessions with the Government in their behalf; he actually saved many of them from Fines, Imprisonments, and other Legal punishments to which they were obnoxious, for their frequent Rebellions against the State. For the Truth of this he Appeals to the Testimony of *James Jewine* of *Crockmare*, *Tho. Smith* of *Drumclaye*, *James Grier* in *Dalwhaine*, and others in the Parish of *Yrongray*, whom he protected from being Fined, and of *John Welch* of *Cornlee*, for whom, when he was Condemned to die for his Rebellion, Mr. *Lawson*, by his Interest with the then Archbishop of *Glasgow*, obtained first a Reprieve, and afterwards a Pardon.

In the next place he Accuses the said Mr. *Lawson* of *being Drunk at* Dumfreis, *and in his return homewards quarrelling with some Drunken Country people, who beat him and made him Bleed, and that upon this Account, he caused five young Men to be Hanged, as being the Persons that did assassinate him.* Now, the Villany as well as Falshood of this Calumny, will clearly appear from the short Narrative I shall give you of this Transaction. Some of Mr. *Lawsons* Parishioners being cited to appear before the Commissioner of that County to take the Test, (to which they had a great Aversion) the said Mr. *Lawson*, at their intreaty,

intreaty, went to the Church of *Traquair*, the place where they were appointed to meet, to requeſt the ſaid Commiſſioner to Grant them a delay. Here he ſtayed, from Ten a Clock in the Morning till about five at Night, and prevailed with him to ſhew all poſſible kindneſs to his Pariſhoners, and to ſet the Impriſoned at Liberty. After which Mr. *Guthry* Miniſter at *Keir*, and Mr. *Lawſon* went to *Trongray* together, not fearing any hurt. They met with none to quarrel with by the way, (as this Scribler impudently avers) but came peaceably to Mr. *Lawſon's* Stable Door. Mr. *Guthry* did ſit on Horſeback till Mr. *Lawſon* ſhould ſend forth his Servant to take in their Horſes; but he being about to enter his own Gate, was Encountred by two Men, one of which Wounded him in the Head twice, calling him *Papiſt Dog*. Mr. *Lawſon* intreated them to Reaſon the matter with him, rather than to ſhed innoceut Blood; to which they at laſt yielded, and entering his Houſe with him, ſeemed to be grieved for what they had done, and after a ſhort ſtay, they went away peaceably. Six of Mr. *Lawſon's* Neighbours hearing of the Cruelty done him, came inſtantly to ſee him; and about half an hour after, theſe blood thirſty Villains returned, (after ſome converſe had with *Rob. Currer* in *Dalwharne* and *Agnes Ferguſon*) and entering Mr, *Lawſon*'s Houſe, dragg'd him forth without his Gate, and ſhut the Doors after them, keeping his Wife and Children, with his Servants and Six Neighbours within. They Guarded the Doors with charged Carabines, threatning Death to any that ſhould offer to come forth; while in the mean time, they were Murthering him without Doors. *Peter Stranger*, (alias *Hutcheſon*) the principal Actor in this Tragedy, hearing Mr. *Lawſon* call upon God to be merciful to his Soul, Rebuked him, ſaying, *O Blaſphemous Dog! What have you, or any of your Godleſs Party to do with God?* In fine, having broken one Sword upon his Skull, he borrowed another from his Neighbour; with which two Swords, he gave him twenty eight ſtroaks; and ſuppoſing him to be Dead, left him weltering in his Blood with ſeventeen Wounds, the Marks whereof are to be ſeen in his Body at this day. The Names of thoſe who were Witneſſes to this Tragical Action, are *Tho. Ferguſon* of *Hallbil*, *John Rabſon* of *Newark*, *John Grier* in *Brae*, *Robert Findlay* in *Undy-hill*, *James Edgar* in *Gateſide*, *James Grier* in *Burns*. And notwithſtanding theſe Witneſſes did ſee Mr. *Lawſon* dragg'd out of his Houſe, and afterwards wallowing in his Blood; yet this Author does moſt impudently aver, that no Man came near to Mr. *Lawſon's* Houſe, and that neither his Wife nor Servants ſaw any Man come thither that

Night. This is a proof of our Author's Ingenuity, of which he so often boasts throughout his Pamphlet, pretending to abhor the Method of inventing Lies, and to have inserted nothing but what he received from credible hands!

It is likewise a most Notorious Falshood, *That five young Men were brought to Mr.* Lawson, *and that he Swore these were the Men that Wounded him, and did thereupon demand Justice.* The ground of this story is thus. After the Murther of the Archbishop of St. *Andrews*, and several Violences done to the rest of the Clergy and other Loyal Subjects; the King with Advice of his Privy Council, commanded his Forces to apprehend the Rebels wheresoever they could find them, or to kill them if they made any Resistance. Next day after the Wounding of Mr. *Lawson*, there was a narrow search made throughout the Country for such Rogues, and the Souldiers falling upon a Party of them that made Resistance, four of them were killed upon the spot, and two apprehended and Hanged near the Church of *Yrongray*. But those were none of them that were at Mr. *Lawson's* Wounding, and therefore it is the height of injustice, as well as impudence, to impute any thing of this to Mr. *Lawson*, he having no hand in it, and they suffering justly for disturbing the Peace of the Kingdom. Mr. *Lawson* was so far from Thirsting after the Blood of his Persecutors; that when *Peter Stranger* the principal Actor of this Tragedy was apprehended in *Dumfreis*, and Mr. *Lawson* being called for by my Lord *Dunmore*, to declare whether that was the Man that Wounded him or not; he turning to the said *Peter Stranger*; said, *if you be the Person that Wounded me, the Lord forgive you, and I forgive you.* Whereupon, although he was Imprisoned for his Rebellion, yet he was never pursued by Mr. *Lawson*; and is yet alive, and in some place of publick Trust in that Kingdom.

Again Mr. *Lawson* is accused *of Covetousness, and of having exacted* 500 l. *of his Parishioners*; which is an equal Falshood to the rest. For upon account of the Cruelties done by the Presbyterian Party, to the Clergy in the West Country; there was an Act made in K. *Charles* the II. his Reign; that if any Clergyman was injured in his Body or Goods, the Parishioners should be obliged to pay 5000 Marks *Scots*. This was Enacted for preventing the Cruelties and Outrages of the Presbyterian party. The King's Advocate hearing of the Barbarous Usage of Mr. *Lawson*; caused the Freeholders of the said Parish, to be cited before the Privy Council, for payment of the said Fine. Mr. *Lawson* was so concerned hereat

hereat, that not being able to Write himself, because of his Wounds, he caused a Letter to be Writ to his Grace the then Archbishop of *Glasgow*, requesting for the mitigation of the ordinary Fine in such Cases. And this his desire was Granted, and the Parish only Fined in a 100 *l.* the fifth part only of the Sum alledged by the Libeller. For the Truth of this Mr. *Lawson* Appeals to all the Freeholders in *Yrongray*, being near thirty in Number. Now I would ask our Author, if in all this carriage of Mr. *Lawson*'s, there be any thing that savours the least of Blood Thirstiness or Cruelty, wherewith he so maliciously charges him? But I don't much Wonder to see Mr. *Lawson* thus Calumniated by them; for they had committed such Acts of Cruelty upon his person, as they could not but be ashamed of; so that the better to slur over their Cruelties against him, they found it necessary to represent him to the World, as the greatest Monster of Cruelty and Immorality, and therefore, they not only accuse him of Thirsting after the Blood of some of his Parishioners; but likewise of being Drunk and Kissing his Wives Maid. Mr. *Lawson* now Aged about 55 years was never charged; Nay, not in his younger days, with any thing of that Nature. But for his further Vindication from all these and other such Aspersions, as this Libeller has maliciously slandered him with; I shall subjoyn two Testimonies in his Favours sent me, with this Information. The first is of Archbishop *Cairncross*, who was for the space of 17 years his Fellow Presbyter, and afterwards his Diocesan. It is as followeth.

London, August 28. 1692.

I Alex. *Archbishop of* Glasgow *do hereby Testifie, that Mr.* James Lawson *Minister of* Yrongrey *in the County of* Galloway, *and Diocess of* Glasgow *in* Scotland, *is a very Orthodox and Zealous Protestant, and of good Esteem in the Church for his Pastoral Gifts, and Pious and Exemplary Life in his Ministry. And as he was forced away from his Church and Family, by the Barbarous Cruelty of a set of Presbyterians in that Nation; so I do heartily recommend him to the tender Favour of all good and well affected Persons; especially to the Reverend and Pious Clergy of the Church of* England, *as a Person qualified to do Service in that Church, as God in his Providence shall afford him occasion. Given under our Hand and Seal the time and place aforesaid.*

Alex. Glasguen.

The other Teſtimony is that of his Neighbouring Clergymen, the Reverend Brethren of that Presbytery, whereof he was a Member.

At Dumfreis June 17. 1690.

WE *Underſubſcribers Miniſters within the Presbytery of* Dumfreis *in* Scotland, *do Teſtifie and Declare, that the Bearer hereof Mr.* James Lawſon *Miniſter at* Yrongray *within the ſaid Presbytery, hath lived within the Precinct thereof, twenty five years and an half, and his behaviour hath been ſuch as became the Goſpel, and his Doctrine ſuch as became a Godly Miniſter, decrying Romiſh Doctrines and Practices, when in greateſt Vigour in this Place; and that for his Zealous, Faithful and plain Dealing, in the Service of his Maſter; he was Wounded and left for Dead, by ſome Ruffians, at his own Houſe, upon the Eighteeenth of* February 1685. *Wherefore we earneſtly deſire, that he may have juſt Encouragement in ſuch places as he ſhall happen to come to, and be permitted to Paſs and Repaſs about his lawful Affairs, without Moleſtation; ſince nothing moves him to Travel abroad, but the Confuſions Raiſed by an inſolent Rabble in this place. That the Premiſſes are of certain Truth is Atteſted, Day and Place above Written by.*

James Glendinning *Miniſter at* Traquair.

Ja. Litle *Miniſter at* Tinwald.

Jo. Malcolm *Miniſter at* Holywood.

A. Kincaid *Miniſter at* Terregles.

Mr. Alex. Meldrum *Miniſter at* Dunſcore.

Mr. Rob. Gardner *Miniſter at* Rerick.

Since this malicious Libeller hath, in this his Scurrilous Pamphlet, Publiſhed ſo many Baſe Calumnies, and Diabolical Lies, againſt that moſt Reverend and Worthy Prelate, Dr. *Patterſon* Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow*, I have taken occaſion here to inſert his Grace's Letter, (containing a Full and Pathetick Vindication of himſelf,) which was ſent to me by a Reverend and Worthy Friend of mine, encloſed in this following Line.

London, October 17. 1693.

SIR,

I Hear that you are to Publiſh the *Animadverſions* that you made upon one of the Libels printed againſt the *Scots* Clergy. The Methods lately taken to ruin that Order of Men in *Scotland*, are as Unjuſt as they are Diabolical. It is a good while ago ſince I knew who was the Author of that Scurrilous Book, and this made me think that the Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow* needed no Apology againſt the Attempts of ſuch a deſpicable Wretch; yet it's poſſible, that what is once made Publick may fall into the hands of ſeveral Perſons who are very apt to be abuſed, and therefore I have ſent here encloſed the Letter that the Archbiſhop wrote to me upon occaſion of that Infamous Pamphlet. I let it go abroad the rather, that I am ſo ſeriouſly appealed to in the Letter it ſelf. I give you my hearty Thanks for your ſolid Confutation of ſeveral malicious and obſcene Lies propagated by that Calumniator. I continue in all Sincerity and Affection,

Your Real Friend

and Servant.

For my worthy Friend Mr. ——

Edin.

Edinburgh-Caſtle, Jan. 21. 1693.

Reverend Brother,

WE may ſay with *Hezekiah*, This is a Day of Trouble, and of Rebuke, and of Blaſphemy. Juſt now (when I am ordered to remove out of theſe Three Kingdoms, and ſo to part from my numerous Family, and ten Motherleſs Children, when they moſt need my Care,) I am ſurpriſed to find in an obſcene and virulent Pamphlet; (written undoubtedly by one of the Firſt-born of the Father of Lies, who dares not own his Villany, Entituled, *An Anſwer to the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*:) Some Paragraphs and Paſſages impudently painting me, as one of the moſt impure and flagitious Wretches that ever was cloathed in Human Fleſh; which, if true, ſhould juſtly expoſe my Name to Infamy, and my Life to Juſtice, as the moſt vile, prophane, and ſacrilegious Monſter, that ever bore a ſacred Character: Which I no ſooner read than I fell on my Knees, and, as the ſame good King *Hezekiah* did with *Senacherib*'s blaſphemous Letter, I ſpread it before the Lord in Prayer, and in the innocence of my Heart, and integrity of my Life, I appealed to him for a juſt Vindication; not that I needed it amongſt them to whom my Life and Manners are known, but only amongſt ſuch as are Strangers to me, and to this Kingdom; upon whom this impudent Son of *Belial* deſigns to impoſe.

Not only the ſenſe of Religion and Purity, but even my Native Modeſty, (for atteſting of which, I do appeal to all the Men and Women in the World with whom I ever converſed, whom I earneſtly obteſt ingenuouſly to declare, if ever they heard one ſingle obſcene Word drop from my Tongue, or ever perceived any immodeſt Inſinuation either directly or indirectly in my Actings or Practice,) made me read theſe obſcene Paſſages with great averſion and horror; moſt of which, I declare in the Preſence of GOD, I never heard, nor read to be ſaid, or done by, or charged upon any Mortal, till I found them there aſſerted as things notoriouſly known of my ſelf, by this infamous Monſter of Prophaneneſs, as well as of villanous and impudent Lying. Modeſty will not allow me to repeat them, ſince they defile the Air, and needs muſt pollute the Eyes of Readers, and Ears of Hearers, and therefore to convel and confute them, I ſhall only ſay this; That if the wicked Author will be

ſo

ſo juſt to himſelf, and to his Party, as to come out from behind the Curtain, pull off his Mask, and prove any of theſe infamous Articles or Paſſages he aſſerts againſt me by two, nay by any one ſingle Witneſs or Perſon of known Virtue and Probity, and of irreproachable Fame, I ſhall not only offer my Name to Infamy, but my Life to Juſtice; and to encourage him ſo to do, I hereby promiſe him as a Reward, and ſhall find him good Surety for it, (tho my Circumſtances are now very low) of Two hundred Pounds Sterling, (and perhaps the ſilly Author needs ſuch a charming Bait) if he ſhall prove any ſingle Article or Inſtance of thoſe infamous and diabolical Aſperſions and Calumnies. Now, if after this open Appeal and Challenge, and offer of this Reward, he ſhall not appear and avow himſelf the Author, nor make at leaſt any one Article of his many Inſtances againſt me appear to be true, I ſhall then leave it to all mankind, to judge if he is not the moſt wicked, impudent, lying Villain, that ever put Pen to Paper, or if I need any further Vindication; eſpecially conſidering, that he aſſerts ſo many Perſons to be privy to thoſe impure and obſcene Paſſages, ſo that he cannot be ſtraitned for want of Evidence and Witneſſes, and is very ſure that the preſent Judges (for I ſhall decline none) will not prove Partial upon my ſide.

I render devoutly Thanks to GOD, who hath continued my Life thus long, and granted me this opportunity thus to appeal and charge this wicked Author, that ſo I may ſatisfie the World of my Innocence, and that this may remain as a ſolid Witneſs for me and my good Name after my Death againſt a Spirit of Lying and Calumny, which (as formerly againſt our pious and worthy Predeceſſors) is now like to go forth, enraged and rampant, againſt thoſe of my Perſwaſion, Order and Character, from ſuch who have long made Lies their Refuge.

Dear Brother,

You know I have lived long in this Church and Kingdom, and have born a greater and more eminent Character, both in Church and State, than my weakneſs and imperfection did deſerve; you know alſo I did not want many, and ſome of great Quality and Power, who ſometimes have been Enemies to me, ſo that had I been ſuch an abominable, wicked, and notour Monſter, as this infamous Scribler endeavours to paint me, I had been as certainly as juſtly thruſt out from the Council-Table, and the Sacred Epiſcopal Office, with diſgrace and infamy; for nothing could have

ſup-

ſupported ſuch a villanous Wretch from feeling the Juſtice of this Church and Nation. You have long converſed with me, and I appeal to you, and to all my Reverend Brethren, Biſhops, Preſbyters and Deacons, to whom I am known, nay to all mankind with whom I ever converſed, and I conjure you and all them to declare to all men, when occaſion offers, as in the ſight of our great and omniſcient Judge, if ever you or they heard or perceived any manner of impure, or ſo much as an immodeſt Word or Inſinuation to flow from me, and I am ready to ſtand or fall at that Bar accordingly.

There is a Party of Men in the World who Treat us, as ſome Perſecuting Heathens did the pure Primitive Chriſtians, whom they ſowed up in Skins of Wolves, Bears, and other Savage Beaſts, and then hounded out their bloody Dogs to devour and tear them in pieces; is it not enough that our Sacred Order is aboliſhed, our ſelves turned out of our Livings and Benefices, (ſo that many of us (alas) are reduced, with our numerous Families, to a ſtate of ſtarving,) that our Perſons are aſſaulted, and beaten in the open Streets of our Capital City; our Houſes rifled, our Families rabled out? Nay, after all this the Malice of ſome is not ſatiated, till Hell and Calumny are called up againſt us; and our Reputation muſt be blacken'd, and our good Names torn, by the moſt impudent Falſhoods and Calumnies which Satan can invent, and his true Offspring publiſh and propagate,; but, Thanks to our GOD, there will be a Reſurrection of blacken'd and murder'd Names, as well as of martyr'd Bodies.

You know I have drawn much of the *Odium* and Spite of a Party upon me, by oppoſing their Errors, their Schiſms, their Rebellious and Treaſonable Principles and Practices, with all the Reaſon and Intereſt I was Maſter of; though in ſtead of endeavouring to take away any of their Lives, (which this Libeller alſo lays to my Charge) I have been at pains to ſave many of them, and have actually prevailed for ſaving of the Lives of ſeveral deluded Creatures of that Party, which can ſtill be atteſted by themſelves.

I grudge not my Lot, in having my Name thus aſſaulted and torn by ſuch little ridiculous Scriblers and Calumniators; it were an intolerable Pride in me to look for better Treatment than our deareſt Saviour, the Holy Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, and noble Army of Martyrs had before me; or than the Primitive holy Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, and Biſhops encounter'd, of whom the World was not worthy; ſuch as St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Chryſoſtome*, *Narciſſus* Biſhop of

of *Jeruſalem*, and others, great and bleſſed Souls; whoſe ſacred Names, and innocent Lives, have been attack'd and blacken'd by the foul Mouths and lying Tongues of Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, and impudent Calumniators; and ſome of them after the ſame manner, and with the ſame fulſom Lies as I am; the Diſciple is too proud, who looks to be better Treated than his Maſter; and that Servant is too ſawcy, who would needs be better uſed than his Lord; who by the then Scribes and Phariſees, was ſaid to be in Covenant with *Beelzebub*: I can comfortably ſay with the holy calumniated Ancient, *Quiſquis detrahit famæ meæ, addit mercedi meæ.*

I doubt not the ſober Presbyterians will be as angry at, and diſſatisfied with, this infamous and anonymus Scribler and Calumniator, as we are; as knowing there can be no more ready nor effectual Method advanced to promote Atheiſm, and to ruine all Religion, than by Lies and Calumnies to invade and blacken the Honour and Reputation of the Clergy and Paſtors of the Church; and whoever, and of whatſoever Perſwaſion he is that dares follow it, can have nothing of Veracity, nor of the meek Spirit of the bleſſed *JESUS*, nor regard to the Honour of our holy Religion in him.

As for me, I ſhall bring no railing Accuſation againſt this impious and obſcene Calumniator, nor againſt any of his Party; but ſhall only ſay, as *Michael* the Archangel did to this Scribler's Maſter, that Father of Lies, when he contended and diſputed with him about the Body of *Moſes*— *The Lord rebuke thee.* I thank GOD I have learned to Pray with the Church, That *God may forgive all my Enemies, Perſecuters, and Slanderers*; and particularly to grant Repentance and Mercy to this ſad pitiful Wretch, who is ſo palpably abandon'd of GOD, and given up to a Reprobate courſe of Lying. When he reads and ponders *Pſalm* 52. *v.* 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. and *Pſalm* 120. throughout, he may by a ſerious and recollected Meditation, through the Divine Grace and Bleſſing, be brought to Repent; as he would avoid the heavy Wrath and Judgments there threatned againſt him, and his way.

Dear Brother,

I writ this in haſte, being crowded with many Thoughts and Affairs here in Priſon ere I part for *Holland*; and can have leaſure to ſay no more at preſent, but to beſeech you to cauſe Print and inſert this Letter (which (I being to go to Sea) may prove the

laſt I ſhall write to you,) in the Anſwer that is to come abroad, for the Vindication of thoſe concerned in that infamous Defamatory Libel.

GOD ever keep you in his Truth and Fear, and under his moſt holy Care. I am,

Reverend Brother,

Your moſt

Affectionate Brother,

and Servant,

Sic Subſcribitur. *Jo. Glaſgow.*

As

As for what this Author Libels againſt Biſhop *Cairncroſs* late Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow*, I need ſay nothing further in anſwer to it, but inſert the Vindication which he himſelf wrote of his Innocence, and cauſed to be printed at *Edinburgh*, for it contains ſuch a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer to all the Particulars Libelled againſt him in this Pamphlet, as plainly diſcovers the malice and wickedneſs of the Author. It is as follows. *Vindication of Archbiſhop* Cairncroſs.

A Vindication of Dr. Alexander Cairncroſs, *late Archbiſhop of* Glaſgow: *Written by himſelf.*

WHen at firſt I found my ſelf Reproached, (in a late Pamphlet, Entituled, *An Anſwer to the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*,) I neglected and contemned it, not only becauſe I was conſcious to my ſelf of mine own Innocency, and that it is no ſmall pain to any man of an ingenuous mind to be raking among Calumnies, and penning Apologies or Vindications of himſelf: But likewiſe becauſe the Author of theſe infamous Aſperſions on the Epiſcopal Clergy hath diſcovered all along ſuch a ſtrain of imbitter'd Malice, that I preſumed they would obtain little credit or belief in the World. For it is notour to all, that becauſe the Author of a late Pamphlet, Entituled, *The Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*, alledged ſome Presbyterian Miniſters guilty of undecent Sayings or Expreſſions from their Pulpits; therefore this Author in his Anſwers reſolving both to recriminate and ſurpaſs him, hath both ſtudied and acted his utmoſt Revenge, in repreſenting ſome of the Epiſcopal Clergy as not only guilty of undecent Sayings and Expreſſions, but alſo guilty of vitious Lives and Practices; and whether true or falſe he values not, if his Malice be but ſatisfied, and they ſo reported of in this World. But now conſidering that a good Name is a tender and choice Bleſſing which every man in juſtice to himſelf ſhould defend and preſerve, and that there is too great an aptitude in moſt People's minds to entertain and believe evil Reports of others, I have thought fit by theſe few Lines to make my juſt Apology, as in the ſight of GOD, againſt the Calumnies caſt upon me in that Pamphlet. Now the whole Paragraph relating to me in that Pamphlet is this:

[*Mr.* Alexander Cairncroſs *Curate in* Dumfreis *had a luſty Maid-ſervant named* Grier, *who was got with Child in his ſervice, and in her Travail refuſed to tell who was the Father of it, but ſent to her Maſter to tell her what ſhe ſhould ſay; who thereupon ſent his Servant, a young Boy*

called Tait, *that owned the Child, and hath kept him in his Service ever since; and that he being Moderator of the Presbytery, received a Letter from Mr.* Menzies *then Curate of* Carlaverock, *renouncing his Conformity to* Episcopacy, *and among other Reasons mentioned, that it was so much adapted to bring in* Popery, *of which the Familiarity betwixt Curates and Papists was a demonstration: At which the said Mr.* Cairncross *was so much surprised, that in a Fury he started up, and said, What the Devil will we all go mad, sure Mr.* Menzies *is beside himself! for his Recantation I value not, but he might have kept his Thumb upon the matter.* What is that, said the rest? *Are ye stupified also,* answered he, *that knows not at this very nick of time that the Papists are our necessary Friends; but since it is so, let him be gone to the rest in the Mountains, which he must do when the Bond comes, or else revoke; and seeing he is such a Fool, I had rather he were hanged than I should anger any Papist anent matters of Controversie about our Opinions. He was afterwards made Archbishop of* Glasgow, *and turned out by King* James, *being esteemed the best of* Scots *Bishops, and it seems could not go the full length his necessary Friends would have had him.*]

Here are two plain matters of Fact, and both base Lies and Calumnies; for as to the first, *That I having a lusty maid named* Grier *begot with Child in my Service, who refused to tell the Father of her Child when in her Travail, &c.* I answer, *First*, Immediately after I heard that Woman *Grier* was suspected of being with Child, I discharged her both from my House and Service; and from my just Resentment against her, I procured from the Magistrates her Imprisonment for some weeks, in the which Prison, and when she was brought before the Kirk-Session, she publickly confessed, That *John Sharp*, Commissar-Clerk in the Town, had committed Wickedness with her, and was Father of her Child; and the said *John Sharp* being summoned, compeared likewise before the Session, and confessed himself guilty with her, and owned the Child; and both of them made publick Satisfaction on the publick Place of Repentance three Lords Days in the Kirk, and before the Congregation of *Dumfreis*: All which is Recorded in the Register of the said Session. And, *Secondly*, For the Boy *Tait*, [*whom it is alledged I sent to her in her Travailing*,] he came not to my Service till eight Years thereafter, she having satisfied and brought forth her Child in the Year 1671, and he entering to my Service in 1679, before which time I did never see him in the Face to my knowledge.

As

As to the second, *That he being Moderator of the Presbytery of* Dumfreis, *received a Letter from Mr.* Menzies *then Curate of* Carlaverock, *renouncing his Conformity to Episcopacy; at which he was so surprised, that in a fury he started up, What the Devil, will we all go mad,* &c. This is likewise a base and horrid Untruth: For first, Mr. *Menzies* sent me no Letter, but being present in the Presbytery, exhibited to the publick Meeting that his Paper of Renunciation; and after Reading and close Reasoning upon it, he pressed to have it insert in the Presbytery Register, which all the Brethren out of a Tenderness to him refused, presuming that he had been imposed upon by others, and that in a little time he might alter both his Course and Opinion; which accordingly thereafter fell out, for in *an.* 1686, he publickly acknowledged his Failzior for his former Renunciation, and returned to the Exercise of his Ministry under Episcopal Government, I being then his Bishop. Secondly, In that Paper which he then exhibited and is yet to be seen, Mr. *Menzies* alledged, That he had heard that Expression before *(of Papists being our necessary Friends)* from one of the Episcopal Clergy, but where, or by whom, or whether true or false, God knows. But as for the Oath and Expressions here alledged uttered by me, I appeal to the Consciences and Declarations of Mr. *Menzies* himself, and of all the Brethren then present, Whether they heard me utter that Oath, and these Expressions here Libell'd and Alledged? And though many of the said Ministers be yet alive, *viz.* Mr. *Richard Scot* then Minister of *Kirkbean*, Mr. *James Lawson* Minister of *Torthorwald*, Mr. *John Malcolm* Minister of *Hollywood*, Mr *Henry Knox* Minister of *Terreagles*, Mr. *John Lyon* Minister of *Urr*, Mr. *Alexander Sangster* Minister of *Kilpatrick*, Mr. *William Wishart* Minister of *New-abbey*, and several others, whom I may presume were present at that time, to whose Testimony I do appeal; yet they being all absent at this time from this place of *Edinburgh*, except Mr. *Richard Scot* and Mr. *Henry Knox* here present, these two have given in the following Declaration subscribed under their Hands:

Declaration of Mr. Richard Scot *and Mr.* Henry Knox.

WE Mr. Richard Scot *late Minister of* Kirkbean, *and Mr.* Henry Knox *late Minister of* Terreagles, *being formerly Members of the Presbytery of* Dumfreis, *and being personally present at that Meeting of Presbytery, wherein Mr.* John Menzies *then Minister of* Carlaverock *did publickly exhibit to that Meeting his Paper of Renunciation of his Conformity with Episcopacy; Do hereby Testifie and Declare, That we did not hear Dr.* Alexander Cairncross *late Archbishop of* Glasgow, *and*

the

then Moderator of the said Presbytery, utter the Oath or Expressions there Libelled and Alledged. Sic Subscribitur,

Mr. *Richard Scot* late Minister of *Kirkbean.*
Mr. *Henry Knox* late Minister of *Terreagles.*

And if any thing more were requisite, I am ready to Depone upon my solemn Oath, That I am altogether free and innocent of all these former Calumnies and Reproaches.

How much then the Author of this Pamphlet hath kept his Promise and Faith given to the Publick in its Preface, (that he would insert nothing relating to the Lives of the Episcopal Clergy but what he had from credible Hands, and his abhorring the method of inventing of Lies,) let the World judge: Only I wish the Author seriously to consider, how Inhumane and Unchristian it is to Persecute some of the Episcopal Clergy with new Cruelties, seeing their present and past Sufferings might sufficiently satisfie, yea satiate the Malice of their bittrest Enemies. And because ye cannot Extirpate them from off the Earth, ye labour to make them Unsavory upon it: Remember there is an infinitely Wise and Just GOD above, who will exactly and impartially Judge all our Words and Actions; and I heartily pray, That GOD may never be provoked to turn back your Reproaches upon you, as *Neh. c. 4. v. 4.*

As also, I would have you to consider how much Religion it self is exposed, and Prophanity and Atheism encouraged, by representing Men of Sacred Offices as Vicious and Scandalous in their Lives: For thus *Julian* the Apostate resolving to extirpate Christianity, slighted the methods of Persecutions and Cruelties used by some former Heathen Emperors against the Christians, but caused Reproach, and accuse the Ministers and Professors of that Holy Religion as guilty of all the Vices and Lewdnesses that might render them and their Sacred Profession odious to the World. And therefore it was a Pious Saying of King *Charles* I. to one asking Liberty from him to Write and Publish the Weakness and Failziors of some Ministers then in opposition to His Majesties Interest; *No*, said the King, *for in so doing, Religion it self will suffer.*

And however your Calumnies and Defamations may be credited among the Credulous or Prejudicate Vulgar, yet I presume by this way you will not gain many Proselytes among those that are Good and Wise: For who, that are endued with the common Principles of

of Juſtice and Charity, will believe men guilty of groſs Crimes upon your bare and naked Narration, without adducing the Atteſtation of any Witneſſes, or yet any ſeeming or juſt Proof? Or who, that is endued with the ſenſe of Religion and Godlineſs, can approve of the methods of bitter Malice, Revenge, and Unchriſtian Calumnies, ſo contrair to all the Rules of Humanity and Chriſtianity, for ſupporting and promoting of any Party or Intereſt whatſoever? And as equal Tenderneſs is to be had to a man's Reputation as to his Life, I allow you to ſearch and examine my Converſation and Life hitherto, and Treat me but by the Rules of common Juſtice, and I am Proof againſt your Malice.

The Concluſion.

What we have already obſerved concerning our Author's malice and diſingenuity in theſe Inſtances we have taken notice of, may ſerve, I think, as a ſufficient Caution to all ingenuous and impartial Readers, not to lay too great ſtreſs upon the Calumnies and Aſperſions of this Author, nor to entertain any the harder Thoughts of our Clergy for being beſpattered by the Pen of this virulent Scribler. For the candid Treatment which theſe Perſons I have mentioned have met with in this Pamphlet, may in a great meaſure enable us to judge what Credit and Authority the reſt of this Author's Aſperſions on our Clergy ought to have, ſince he deals ſo baſely and diſingenuouſly in all theſe Inſtances. He invents Stories which he cannot find the leaſt ſhadow of Truth to juſtifie, for the Truth of ſome of his matters of Fact he appeals to Records, where there is not the leaſt mention of them to be found; nay, he ſticks at nothing ſo he but can ſerve his main End and Deſign, which is to blacken the Fame and Reputation of our Clergy, and to render their Sacred Function odious to all Mankind. I pray GOD to give this Author a deep ſenſe of the Villany of this his Deſign, that he may Repent in time, and ſave his Soul before it is too late. It is a Scandal and a Reproach to our Religion, that ſuch Helliſh and Diabolical Practices, as this Author uſes, ſhould be ſo much as heard of in any of thoſe places where the Name of *Chriſt* is invocated; ſuch kind of Practices are ſo Inhumane, and ſo contrary to the Spirit of Chriſtianity, that they muſt needs make the Authors and Abettors of them ſtink in the Noſtrils of all Good and Religious Men.

All

All that I have further to add now, is only to beg my Reader's Pardon, for detaining him so long in searching into the Rubbish of a parcel of Prophane and Lewd Stories. I must needs own it is no very pleasing Task to me, to be raking into such a Dunghil; but finding the Reputation of some of our Clergy very much injured among Strangers, by reason of the Calumnies and Aspersions of this obscure Writer; I thought my self obliged, from the Duty I owe to my Country, and from the Respect we all ought to have for the Sacred Character of *Christ's Ambassadors* and *Ministers*, to contribute my small Endeavours for asserting and vindicating the Oppressed Innocence of our Clergy, and for detecting the Malice and Falshood of this Libeller's Aspersions. In which I hope I have been so successful with this small Essay, that after perusal thereof, every Disinterested Person will readily acknowledge, That the Author of this Virulent Libel against our Clergy has been totally acted by the Spirit of Malice and Envy, and has dealt so basely and disingenuously in all his Relations which I have had occasion to search into, that his bare Accusation can be of no Authority against the most obnoxious Member of any Nation or Society.

FINIS.